

THE ESSENTIAL SAKER



THE ESSENTIAL  
SAKER II

*Civilizational Choices and Geopolitics:  
The Russian challenge to the Hegemony  
of the AngloZionist Empire*



Published by Saker Analytics LLC

## **Publishing Information.**

Saker Analytics, LLC  
1000 N. West Street  
Suite 1200 #1588  
Wilmington, DE  
USA 19801

Copyright © 2017

## Dedication

To Ron Unz and Amarynth for making this book possible, to Herb for being a wonderful IT “guru”, to Walter and Alena for standing by me in the darkest hour, to Sheikh Imran Hosein and his wife for their immense kindness, to the many Muslims who gave me their support and friendship and, of course, to the wonderful Saker Community.

With gratitude we thank our contributors and volunteers; Dalibor for art, ‘the 100th Monkey’ for manuscript editing, and Todd for setup assistance.

The printing of this book was made possible by the kind generosity of Gottfried Pflugbeil


# Contents

Publishing Information .....	ii
Dedication.....	iii
Contents .....	iv
About the Author.....	x
Foreword by Alexander Mercouris.....	xiii
Forward by Catherine Austin Fitts.....	xiv
Preface .....	xix
TheSaker.is Blog & The Worldwide Saker Community .....	xxii
New Initiatives .....	xxiii
The Essential Saker: Book II - Section 1 .....	1
A Tale of Two World Orders .....	1
Europe in Free Fall.....	6
The 28-member EU makes no economic sense.....	6
The EU is on the verge of a social and cultural collapse.....	7
The EU is just a colony of the United States unable to defend her own interests .....	11
The EU is in a deep political crisis .....	12
The Moral Yardstick of the Ukrainian War (Saker Rant) .....	14
First I bash some Russians .....	14
Next, I bash a few American Leftists .....	18
And, in conclusion, I address the “noble Europeans”! .....	21
The new face of Europe .....	22
The moral yardstick of the Ukrainian war .....	22
Putin and Israel – A Complex and Multi-Layered Relationship .....	24
A Few Disjointed Thoughts on the Events in Cologne.....	40
Israel vs Iran: Israel Loses *Big* Time .....	47
Putin's Biggest Failure .....	54
Why I Use the Term ‘AngloZionist’, and Why It’s Important .....	62
Could Russia Still Become an Ally of the West? .....	77
The Writing is on the Wall for the European Union .....	84
Saker Rant about a Stolen Europe .....	91
The EU’s “Suicide by Reality Denial” .....	102

The Controversy about Stalin – A “Basket” of Preliminary Considerations .....	110
A Negative View of Christianity and Religion in General.....	129
The three "levels of religious satisfaction" .....	130
Religion as a basis for ethical values .....	131
Religion as a form of national self-definition.....	132
Religion as an ideological tool of statecraft .....	134
The modern "ecumenism" of pseudo-religions .....	141
The ethos of YOLO and DILLIGAF.....	149
Conclusion – what religion is not.....	151
Counter-Propaganda, Russian Style .....	154
In Syria, Russia Defends Civilization – .....	162
the West Sides with Barbarism .....	162
Debunking popular clichés about modern warfare.....	165
“What would a war between Russia and the USA look like?” .....	165
Cliché No 1: The US military has a huge conventional advantage over Russia	166
Cliché No 2: An attacker needs a 3:1 or even 4:1 advantage over the defender	167
Cliché No 3: High technology wins the day .....	168
Cliché No 4: Big military budgets win the day.....	171
Cliché No 5: Big military alliances help win wars .....	172
Cliché No 6: Forward deployment gives a major advantage .....	174
Cliché No 7: The US and NATO are protecting East European countries.....	175
Conclusion .....	178
How Russia is preparing for WWII.....	182
The West’s actions:.....	182
The Russian reaction.....	185
The re-creation of the First Guards Tank Army .....	186
The deployment of the Iskander-M operational-tactical missile system.....	187
The deployment of the Sarmat ICBM .....	188
The deployment of the Status-6 strategic torpedo .....	189
Evaluation:.....	190
Led by Poland, the European “House Negroes” Compete for the Darwin Awards	198
False flags fluttering in the Empire’s hot air .....	205
Assessing the Russian military as an instrument of power .....	213
Russia is not the Soviet Union.....	214

The Russian armed forces are relatively small .....	215
The Russians are *not* coming.....	217
The true “reach” of the Russian armed forces.....	218
The real meaning of A2AD.....	222
The Ukraine is located well inside Russkie-land .....	224
Conclusion: Russia ain’t the Soviet Union and it ain’t the USA .....	225
Conclusion .....	229
The case for the breakup of the Ukraine .....	231
Somalia on the EU.....	232
The Russians ain’t coming (yet again) .....	234
The main problem.....	236
Small is beautiful.....	237
Problems, caveats, and risks .....	238
The Ancient Spiritual Roots of Russophobia .....	240
Introduction.....	240
A 2000-year-old dispute.....	241
A 1000-year-old dispute.....	244
The feared and hated witness .....	247
The modern dispute.....	248
Conclusion .....	250
2016: the year of Russia’s triumph .....	252
The Ukraine; score 5/5 .....	253
The Donbass; score 3/5.....	254
Crimea; score 5/5.....	254
The United States; score 5/5 .....	255
NATO; score 4/5.....	258
The EU; score 5/5 .....	259
The Russian economy; score 3/5.....	260
The Russian public opinion; score 4/5.....	261
Russian Russophobes; score 4/5.....	262
Syria; score 5/5.....	264
The Russophobic hysteria in the West; score 3/5.....	266
Terrorism; score 4/5.....	269
Conclusion .....	271

The Best Armed Forces on the Planet?.....	273
US vs. Iran – A War of Apples vs. Oranges .....	285
The Neocons and the “Deep State” Have Neutered Trump; It’s Over Folks!.....	298
The Empire Should Be Placed On Suicide Watch .....	303
Searching for Russia .....	314
How to Bring Down the Elephant in the Room.....	325
A painful, but necessary, clarification: .....	325
First, terminology:.....	326
Making sense of the crazies.....	330
Syria.....	330
Russia .....	331
Making sense of Trump.....	333
Living with ZOG :-)	334
Houston, we got a problem.....	336
And did I mention that the DPRK has nukes?.....	338
So what does that have to do with the ZOG and the Ziocons?.....	339
Where do we go from here? .....	341
Why Voting for Trump was the Right Thing to Do (7 Reasons) .....	349
The Future of Islam in Western Europe.....	354
The Essential Saker: Book II, Section 2.....	363
Russia and Islam, Part One: Introduction and Definitions.....	363
Russia and Islam, Part Two: Russian Orthodoxy.....	368
Russia and Islam, Part Three: Internal Russian Politics .....	377
Russia and Islam, Part Four: “Islam” as a Threat.....	382
Russia and Islam, Part Five: “Islam” as an Ally.....	394
Russia and Islam, Part Six: the Kremlin .....	400
Russia and Islam, Part Seven: the Weatherman’s Cop Out.....	415
Russia version one:.....	416
Russia number two:.....	418
What does that mean for Muslims in Russia and abroad?.....	420
The main paradox .....	421
Personalizing ideas.....	422
Russia and Islam, Part Eight: Working Together, a basic “How-to” .....	424
The fundamentally misguided yet typical approach: .....	425
Irreconcilable theological differences between Christianity and Islam .....	425

Christians and Muslims – friends or foes? What does history show?.....	427
So where do we go from here?.....	429
The common ground – ethics: .....	430
What does the post-Christian and secular West stand for today? .....	430
A perfect opportunity – the Russian Constitution.....	432
Conclusion .....	435
Special words to any naysayers.....	437
<b>Russia and Islam, Part Nine: Connecting the Dots and Discerning the Future.....</b>	<b>440</b>
First, a few key dots:.....	440
1) The Russian intervention in Syria .....	440
2) How Russia transformed Turkey from an enemy to a potential ally .....	442
3) Russia and the “Chechen model” as a unique case in the Muslim world.....	444
Now an attempt at discerning the future.....	447
The struggle for the future of Islam.....	453
Russia’s “Civilizational Choice”.....	456
The Fighting Imam of Donbass (MUST SEE!) .....	464
Ramzan Kadyrov Offers Putin His Own *Personal* Volunteer Chechen Special Force.....	465
The video: .....	466
Transcript of Kadyrov’s words:.....	466
A Muslim Police Officer Dies a Hero’s Death and Receives Russia’s Highest Honorary Title “Hero of Russia” .....	469
The video: .....	470
The Essential Saker: Book II, Section III .....	471
Charlie Hebdo .....	471
I am NOT Charlie.....	471
Charlie Hebdo for the Darwin Awards.....	471
“Spitting in people’s souls”.....	472
In the Charlie Hebdo Psyop Double Standards, Logical Fallacies and Crass Ignorance are Everywhere.....	475
 In Search of Russia – Guns & Butter Interview.....	483
Trump and Putin - Setting the Record Straight – Guns & Butter Interview .....	512



Afterword by Cynthia McKinney..... 541



## About the Author

**The Saker** (the pen name chosen by Andrei Raevsky) is the founder of the **Saker Community of Blogs**, the only such international and multi-lingual community of blogs. It now features:

**7 blogs** (Main, French, Russian, Oceanian, Latin American, Italian, Serbian) written in

**7 languages** (English, Russian, French, Spanish, Italian, Serbian and Portuguese) on

**4 continents** (North and South America, Europe, Asia, Oceania) with

**4 YouTube Channels** (Main, Oceania, French, Italian).

The main blog alone gets well over two million page views per month.

The six further daughter blogs representing an astoundingly large area of our world were born from the initial Saker Blog. This grassroots organic development grew out of an existential comment:

*“What society had done to me – made me completely powerless – it has also done to you. And just the way it had made me feel like a single lonely nutcase, it made you feel like you were the only one. I most sincerely believe that the real reason for the success of this blog, its global community, its vibrant discussions and the amazing outpouring of kindness towards me are in the following simple fact:*

*I inadvertently made it possible for many thousands of people to realize they were not alone, not crazy, not wrong but that quite literally “we are everywhere”!*

*The second thing that I did, again quite inadvertently, is to **empower those who felt powerless to do something, to make a change, to really have an impact.**”*

From *Submarines in the Desert* – The Saker.

Content, content providers and truth tellers flocked to The Saker’s blog which today hosts sensitive, wide-ranging and hot topics, provided by giants in the journalism field such as Pepe Escobar, Ramin Mazaheri, Alexander Mercouris, Ghassan Kadi, Peter Koenig, Sheik Imram Hussein and regular analysis by The Saker himself complimented by a number of other writers who sometimes prefer to remain anonymous, reporting from across the world.

The Saker is regularly interviewed by greats, such as Catherine Austin Fitts of the Solari Report and Bonnie Faulkner of Guns and Butter. The vibrant Movable Feast Café as well as the Commenter’s Corner affords members, friends, readers and brothers-in-arms an opportunity to bring their poetry, their musings, their noodlings and their own analysis to the blog.

Today TheSaker.is website and TheSaker.LLC still survive on membership donations and community support. There is a small Steering Committee in place, made up of The Saker, the Webmaster, the Director of Research and the Operational Support person. This small group is strengthened by a network of around 100 much-appreciated volunteers who do various tasks, such as art, or videos or other administrative tasks.

This wealth of information is new content, specifically, to the eyes and ears of those in the West and presents a deeply analytical-educational treasure trove that unfolds history "as she has never been told".

The Saker's blog is shaped by readers and delivers content that can only be described as incisive; shattering what we thought we once knew hence producing new and powerful thinking in the geopolitical arena of our world.

New content and new activities on the Saker blog, daughter blogs, and other outreach, will unerringly retain focus on:

**Empowering those who felt powerless to do something, to make a change, to really have an impact and resist!**



## Foreword by Alexander Mercouris

This compilation brings together a series of essays and two interviews of the person who I and many others consider the single most insightful commentator on world affairs. This is far more than just a collection of essays on international relations. What singles the Saker out, and makes his analysis of world affairs so penetrating, is his knowledge and interest in ideas, which gives him a unique ability to look behind the visible actions of the players to the motives behind them. He is able to do this because of his quite phenomenal erudition, which makes it possible for him to speak knowledgeably and with authority on such subjects as military strategy, religion (one of the prime drivers of political action), culture, politics and history. The result is that he is able to discuss not just what people do but *why* they do what they do; doing so with unflinching courage and clarity, and bringing to bear on this question, not just his formidable intellect and analytical skills - honed during the Cold War in work for amongst others the General Staff of a European country, - but his deep sense of Christian morality. The result is this brilliant collection, which ought to be mandatory reading for anyone interested in the way the world works today.



## Forward by Catherine Austin Fitts

*“To love. To be loved. To never forget your own insignificance. To never get used to the unspeakable violence and the vulgar disparity of life around you. To seek joy in the saddest places. To pursue beauty to its lair. To never simplify what is complicated or complicate what is simple. To respect strength, never power. Above all, to watch. To try and understand. To never look away. And never, never to forget.”*

Arundhati Roy

Today I journeyed from Dhaka in Bangladesh to a beautiful tropical lake for a picnic with former US Congresswoman Cynthia McKinney, now a professor of political science here. Accompanying us were some students from two of her classes – *Leadership & Organizational Change* and *Entrepreneurship*. Our lively conversation was focused on how to create a more prosperous economy and a more human society.

Our topics ranged from the transport infrastructure of Dhaka to the rivers that flow from the mountains of Nepal; from the legal structures of the Bangladesh stock market to the leadership of the sovereign wealth fund of Norway; from the struggles of small farmers in my home base in Hickory Valley, Tennessee, to those of farmers here in the Asian subcontinent

As the picnic commenced, Cynthia started to enjoy a large, ripe pear. She asked, “Where is this pear from?” The student who had shopped in the fresh fruits and vegetables market that morning said, “South Africa.” “South Africa!” exclaimed Cynthia in surprise,

wondering how such a large, delicious, pear came all the way from the southern tip of Africa to the street markets of Asia. To which her student replied, “ Yes, that is the kind of globalization that we want to happen.” Which is to say, this kind of globalization occurs when people are free to transact when and with whom they please. Marvelous things can happen, like so many pears grown in South African orchards that make their way through many hands (while still delicious) to tiny Bengal delta street stalls, where students can buy them in the early morning.

One of the students asked me for my favorite sources of information about globalization and geopolitics. Soon Cynthia and I were telling the students about the Saker and his website, *The Vineyard of the Saker*.

Born and raised in Switzerland by Russian *émigré* parents who were refugees from the Bolshevik Revolution, the Saker studied in the United States and became a European military analyst. Opposed to the destruction of successive countries in Eastern Europe (*aka* the US/NATO wars), he reinvented himself as a software engineer who now lives in the United States (as he puts it, “the Imperial Homeland”). Frustrated by the Neocon rise to power and the ongoing destruction within Europe, the Saker as an analyst reacted to these new important events and started to write about them.

The rest is history. When war in the Ukraine splashed its way across Western headlines, readership at *The Vineyard of the Saker* exploded.

His handle, “the Saker” comes from the saker falcon, a species of large falcon that breeds from Eastern Europe across Eurasia to Manchuria. Indeed, his viewpoint is Eastern...and Western, as well. The Saker looks at current events from multiple points-of-view, starting with the big “P” of geopolitics. Then, like a falcon, he swoops down to the most intimate personal details of the moment

or event and then he rises back onto the widest geopolitical horizon.

As the Neocons accelerated the unraveling of the world order, the Saker's analysis ended up having a far more profound impact than when the Establishment was paying him. It would not surprise me if his former employers now pay someone else to read everything the Saker says and writes.

Pressured by his growing global audience, he edited years of his commentary into his first collection: *The Essential Saker: From the Trenches of the Emerging Multipolar World*.

I purchased this collection in electronic form. Before checking the length, I forwarded it to my assistant and asked her to print it out for me and leave it on the ottoman in my den. Imagine my surprise the next day to find almost 1,000 pages stacked neatly on the ottoman. Undaunted, I decided I would grab the top inch of paper at each lunch and dinner and steadily work my way through. Thus began a process of dining with the Saker.

Americans are taught to see the world in very simple terms. One of my colleagues always reminds me that J.S. Bach composed with 24 or more tracks, but in America we listen to the drumbeat – just one or two tracks. Our news for the most part is fake news – oversimplified and dumbed down.

The globalization that we want to happen is multipolar and multitrack – there are many cultures, many languages, and many landscapes. This world is rich, complex, and fractal. A mind looking to escape death by drumbeats and fake news can find refreshment here.

The insights in Saker's first book are so rich and the humor so full of belly laughs — pulling no punches on the absurdity of the “official reality” and the endless stream of perversions and dirty tricks that define covert warfare in our world — that I found myself looking forward to my “Saker breaks” at each lunch and dinner.



The day after I finished the book, I literally felt a deep sadness as I walked into my den and saw the ottoman empty. There was no more Saker to roar into my life, to fill it with humanity.

Throughout our world we face a great separation – between those who choose an inhuman way forward and those who chose a human future. This is an age-old battle – at the root a spiritual battle - between the forces of good and evil made more dramatic by powerful new technology and the weapons it creates.

The Neocons and their allies do their very best to persuade us that their power is complete – that resistance is hopeless in the face of the demonic. However, as you read the Saker, you realize that the world is full of many worlds, each full of extraordinary people committed to a human future, all pushing back in powerful and creative ways. They remind us of the English poet Shelley, who wrote, “Ye are many, they are few.”

This is the secret – we are not alone. Quite the contrary – there are allies everywhere. You will meet many of them in the Saker’s pages and marvel at their strength and goodness. You will remember the great truth from scripture, “Where two or more are gathered in my name, there am I.” Not only are we not alone, we can call on the greatest power on our planet to help us.

In 2015, I asked the Saker to join me for quarterly Solari Reports, to discuss the emerging multipolar world. The Saker talks geopolitics and military intelligence, and I talk money, and as we sort through our different jigsaw puzzle pieces, we keep looking for those opportunities to shift our audience towards creating that multipolar world – one that engages and attracts our young people. It is the same conversation that Cynthia and her students and I were having here in Bangladesh. The global “invention rooms” are everywhere.

For many months I have asked the Saker, “please do publish a new book.” At last, here it is. If you got this copy when it first came

out, then you know that there is a large stack of papers on the ottoman in my den. I will be dining with the Saker and laughing my head off until they are gone.

June 30, 2017

Dhaka, Bangladesh



## Preface

This volume is composed of three sections: first, a collection of essays I wrote for the Unz Review (<http://www.unz.com/>) between July 2015 and June 2017, followed by an expanded list of my articles on the topic of Islam and finally a transcript of two interviews Bonnie Faulkner had with me for her show “Guns and Butter” (<http://gunsandbutter.org/>) for Pacifica Radio (<http://pacificanetwork.org/>).

The first part represents what I believe are my most important analyses on a wide variety of topics including geopolitics, military strategy and operations, Russian politics, spirituality, the crises in Europe, the war in Syria and the decay of what I call the AngloZionist Empire. Far from being “all over the place” I believe that all these topics are very tightly knit together and that *they can only be understood when taken together*. Sometimes this relationship can be hidden or subtle, but it is always profound.

What we are witnessing today is a war between what I call the “Russian civilizational realm” and what is usually referred to as “the West”. This is a new kind of war, not the “hybrid” war conjured up by the Pentagon's propaganda machine, but a new kind of war nonetheless. It is roughly 80% informational, 15% economic and 5% kinetic/military. This might sound comparatively benign until you realize that the two sides are locked in a ruthless existential struggle for their very survival: only one side will win, the other one will bite the dust. By its very nature the AngloZionist Empire cannot accept even the existence of another alternative model. It does not really matter what that other model is; if it exists then it must be destroyed – such is the imperative of an Empire which sees itself as the Hegemon called by destiny to rule the planet (think of Obama's “indispensable nation”).

Russia, along with China and the SCO/BRICS countries offer something very different: a multi-polar world in which each country fully retains its cultural uniqueness and sovereignty and in which relationships between countries are ruled not by a single “world policeman” but by the rule of law. Sound naïve? Maybe. But consider that many countries that support this alternative model have been empires in the past and that they have developed a social consensus which states that empires are very bad for the nations which host them. This feeling is particularly strong in Russia where a vast majority of people want their country to be first and foremost a “normal” country simply because the Russian people have in the past paid too big a price in blood and money for the very dubious privilege (a curse, really) of being an Empire for 3 centuries. The first part of this volume covers many of the issues involved in this process of building a “New Russia” which would not be an Empire like in the past, but a “normal” yet strong, free and sovereign state with no planetary overlord dictating how her people must live.

The second part of the book includes all the analyses on the topic of “Russia and Islam” included in my first book (*The Essential Saker: From the trenches of the emerging multipolar world*) and several new essays which all focus on Islam-related issues. I decided to include all these essays because I consider that Islam is arguably the single most important and misunderstood phenomenon in modern geopolitics. Islam is also the one topic which is most systematically misrepresented by the Empire's propaganda machine.

The book concludes with the transcripts of two interviews Bonnie Faulkner had with me and which encapsulate, in a concentrated form, most of the topics discussed in this book..

My hope is that this book will be a continuation, if you wish, of the issues I introduced in my first book. The past two years have

seen immensely important events take place (including the rejection of Hillary Clinton by the American people) and while I do not always discuss them directly (for that you can go directly to the Saker blog (<http://thesaker.is/>) I hope that the current volume provides a valuable context/background to these events. Instead of trying to cover it all, I tried to focus on that which is most misunderstood, obfuscated or misrepresented.

You will now decide if I have succeeded or not.

I conclude by repeating here what I wrote in my first book and what I have repeated many times on the blog: this book, like the previous one, and the blog itself has only been made possible by you, the Saker community, and all those who have helped me in more ways than I can count.

The Saker



# TheSaker.is Blog & The Worldwide Saker Community

From a small blog started in 2007 by an unknown man feeling powerless, who simply wanted to write whatever he wanted to write, The Saker blog exploded to currently 2-million visitors and 20,000 new and unique visitors per month.

Six further daughter blogs representing an astoundingly large area of our world were born from the initial Saker Blog. This grassroots organic development grew out of an existential comment:

*“What society had done to me – made me completely powerless – it has also done to you. And just the way it had made me feel like a single lonely nutcase, it made you feel like you were the only one. I most sincerely believe that the real reason for the success of this blog, its global community, its vibrant discussions and the amazing outpouring of kindness towards me are in the following simple fact:*

***I inadvertently made it possible for many thousands of people to realize they were not alone, not crazy, not wrong but that quite literally “we are everywhere”!***

*The second thing that I did, again quite inadvertently, is to **empower those who felt powerless to do something, to make a change, to really have an impact.**”f*

From Submarines in the Desert - TheSaker.

Content, content providers and truth tellers flocked to The Saker's blog which today hosts sensitive, wide-ranging and hot topics, provided by giants in the journalism field such as Pepe Escobar, Ghassan Kadi, Peter Koenig, Sheik Imram Hussein, and regular analysis by The Saker himself complimented by a number of other writers who sometimes prefer to remain anonymous; reporting from across the world.

The Saker is regularly interviewed by greats, such as Catherine Austin Fitts and Bonnie Faulkner of Guns and Butter. The vibrant Movable Feast Café as well as the Commenter's Corner affords members, friends, readers and brothers-in-arms an opportunity to bring their poetry, their musings, their noodlings and their own analysis to the blog.

During this time The Saker published The Essential Saker, a book featuring some of his most cutting-edge essays, our Director of Research published two books on Russia, the Essential Saker II is being prepared for publication at present, and a new website on the History of the Orthodox Peoples was launched.

This wealth of information is new content to the eyes and ears of specifically those in the West and presents a deeply analytical-educational treasure trove that unfolds history "as she has never been told".

## **New Initiatives**

A number of new main activities are planned for the rest of this year and into 2018, such as a News Feed, the Community Cooperative, 'Ask Me Anything' online conference with The Saker, a new book with Sheik Imram Hussein for publication next year, and more content for the readers, community, and members.

The Saker's blog is shaped by readers and delivers content that can only be described as incisive, shattering what we thought we

once knew hence producing new and powerful thinking in the geopolitical arena of our world.

New content and new activities on the Saker blog, daughter blogs, and other outreach, will unerringly retain focus on **empowering those who felt powerless to do something, to make a change, to really have an impact.**





# **The Essential Saker: Book II - Section 1**

## **A Tale of Two World Orders**

July 10, 2015

Two historical summits are taking place this week: the crisis talk in France and Germany about the Greek crisis and the simultaneous meeting of the BRICS and Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) countries in Ufa, Russia. These two meetings could hardly be more different.

The Euro bureaucrats are scrambling to prevent a domino effect in which Greece would leave the Eurozone and set a precedent for other Mediterranean countries such as Italy, Spain, and even France. But there is really much more at stake here than the comparatively small Greek debts, the solvency of European banks or even the future of the Euro. What is really at stake is the credibility and future of the entire "Euro project" and thus the future of the oligarchy which created it.

The EU elites have put an immense amount of political and personal capital into the creation of what one could call a "Bilderberger Europe"; one run by the elites and on behalf of the USA-promoted New World Order (NWO). Just like the US elites having put their full credibility behind the official 911 narrative against all empirical evidence, so the Europeans have put their full credibility behind a "grand EU" project even though it was obvious that this project was not viable. And now reality is coming back with a vengeance: Simply put, the EU is way too big. Not only was the expansion of the EU to the East a huge mistake, but even the

western EU is really the artificial assembly of a Mediterranean Europe and a Northern Europe as Nigel Farage so aptly put it here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=94UcyJnRcGU>. Finally, it is pretty obvious that the current EU was built against the will of many, if not most, of the people of Europe. As a result, the Euro bureaucrats are now fighting to keep their dying project alive as long as possible.

What we are witnessing these days in Ufa, Russia, could not be any more different. The simultaneous meeting of the BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa) and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) countries (China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan) marks the gathering of a future world order, not one directed by the USA or the West, but one simply built without them, which is even more humiliating. In fact, the BRICS/SCO 'combo' is a real nightmare for the AngloZionist Empire (for the precise reasons for my using this term, please see: <http://thesaker.is/terminology/>).

It has already been announced that India and Pakistan will become full members of the SCO. So the full list of BRICS/SCO members will now look like this: Brazil, China, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Russia, South Africa, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan. The BRICS/SCO will thus include two Permanent UN Security Council members and four countries with nuclear weapons (only three NATO countries have nukes!). Its members account for a full third of the world's land area; they produce 16 trillion dollars in GDP; and have a population of three billion people or half of the global population. The SCO population stands at 1.6 billion people or one-fourth of the Earth's population which produces \$11.6 trillion in GDP. Furthermore, the BRICS/SCO countries are already working on a new development bank whose aim is to create an alternative to the IMF and World Bank. But, most importantly, the SCO is growing even further and might soon

welcome Belarus and Iran as full members. And the door is wide open for more members, possibly even Greece (if the Grexit happens).

The core of this alternative New World Order is, of course, Russia and China. Without them, neither the BRICS nor the SCO would make any sense. The most amazing feature of this Russian-Chinese 'core' is the way it was formed. Rather than creating a formal alliance, Putin and Xi did something which, as far as I know, has never been done in the past: they have turned their two super-countries (or ex-empires, pick your term) into **symbionts**, two **separate** organisms which **fully depend** on each other. China has agreed to become fully dependent on Russia for energy and high technology (especially defense and space) while Russia has agreed to become fully dependent on China economically. It is precisely because China and Russia are so different from each other that they form the perfect match, like two puzzle pieces, who perfectly fit each other.

For centuries the Anglo-Saxons have feared the unification of the European landmass as a result of a Russian-German alliance, and they have been very successful at preventing it. For centuries the major sea powers have ruled the world. But what no western geostrategist had ever envisioned is the possibility that Russia would simply turn East and agree to a symbiotic relationship with China. The sheer size of what I call the Russian-Chinese Strategic Partnership (RCSP) makes not only Germany but even all of Europe basically irrelevant. In fact, the AngloZionist Empire simply does not have the means to influence this dynamic in any significant way. Had Russia and China signed some kind of formal alliance, there would always have been the possibility for either country to change course, but once a symbiosis is created, the two symbionts become inseparable, joined not only at the hip, but also

at the heart and lungs (even if they each keep their own separate “brains”, i.e. governments).

What is so attractive to the rest of the world in this BRICS/SCO alternative is that neither Russia nor China has any imperial ambitions. Both of these countries have been empires in the past, and both have paid a huge price for that imperial status. Furthermore, they both have carefully observed how the USA has arrogantly overstretched itself over the entire planet resulting in a dialectical anti-American reaction worldwide. While the White House and the corporate media keep scaring those still willing to listen to them with tales about the “resurgent Russia” and the “assertive China”, the reality is that neither of these two countries has any desire at all to replace the USA as the world hegemon. You will never see China or Russia covering the globe with 700+ military bases, or fighting elective wars on a yearly basis or spending more on “defense” (i.e. aggression) than the rest of the planet combined. They will not build a 600 ship navy or even a fleet of twelve aircraft carriers to “project power” worldwide. And they will most definitely not point a “space gun” at the entire planet with megalomaniacal projects such a Prompt Global Strike ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prompt\\_Global\\_Strike](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prompt_Global_Strike)) weapon.

What Russia, China, and the BRICS/SCO countries want is an international order in which security is truly collective, according to the principle that “if you feel threatened then I am not safe”. They want a cooperative order in which countries are allowed (and even encouraged) to follow their own societal development model. Iran, for example, will not have to cease being an Islamic Republic after joining the SCO. They want to get rid of the *comprador* elites whose loyalty lies with foreign interests and encourage the “sovereignization” of each country. Finally, they want an international order ruled by the rule of law and not by the “might makes right” principle which has been the hallmark of the

European civilization since the Crusades. And the key thing to understand is this; they don't want that because they are so kind and noble, but because they **sincerely perceive this to be in their pragmatic self-interest.**

So while the European ruling plutocracy is trying to find a new way to further dispossess the Greek people and keep southern Europe subjugated to the rule of international bankers and financiers, the participants of the double summit in Ufa are laying the basis of a new world order, but not at all the New World Order predicted by George H.W. Bush. One could say that they are building an anti-New World Order.

Predictably, the Western elites and their corporate media are in a "deep denial" mode. Not only do they not comment much about this truly historical event, but when they do comment about it, they assiduously avoid discussing the immense implications which these events will have for the entire planet. This borders on magical thinking; if I close my eyes hard enough and long enough this nightmare will eventually vanish.

It won't.

What will happen is that the US dollar will gradually be pushed out of the BRICS/SCO zone. US military power will not be challenged; it will be made irrelevant by a completely changed international environment in which even 700+ military bases worldwide will make no difference and, thus, no sense.

The meeting in Ufa will be remembered as the moment in history when the so-called "West" began being irrelevant.



# Europe in Free Fall

August 27, 2015

Europe is in free fall. Nobody can doubt that anymore. In fact, the EU is simultaneously suffering from several crucial problems and any one of them could potentially become catastrophic. Let's look at them one by one.

## **The 28-member EU makes no economic sense**

The most obvious problem for the EU is that it makes absolutely no economic sense. Initially, in the early 1950s, there was a small group of not too dissimilar nations which decided to integrate their economies; these were the so-called Inner Six who founded the European Community (EC): Belgium, France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. In 1960 this "core group" was joined by seven more countries, the Outer Seven, who were unwilling to join the EC but wanted to join a European Free Trade Association (EFTA). These are Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. Together these countries formed what could loosely be called "most of western Europe". For all their faults, these treaties did reflect a reality – that the countries participating in them had much in common and that their peoples wanted to join forces. After 1960, the history of the European integration and expansion became very complicated and while it progressed in zigzags with regular setbacks, at the end of the day this process ended growing uncontrollably, just like a malignant tumor. Today the EU includes 28 (!) member states including all of what used to be called “central” and “eastern” Europe – even the ex-Soviet Baltic Republics are now part of this new union. The problem is that

while such an expansion was attractive to the European elites for ideological reasons, such huge expansion makes no economic sense at all. What do Sweden, Germany, Latvia, Greece and Bulgaria have in common? Very little, of course.

Now cracks are clearly appearing. The Greek crisis and the threat of a “Grexit” has the potential for a domino effect involving the rest of the so-called “PIGS” (Portugal, Italy, Greece and Spain). Even France is threatened by the consequences of these crises. The European currency – the Euro – is a “currency without a mission”. Is it supposed to support the German economy or the Greek one? Nobody knows, at least officially. In reality, of course, everybody understands that Frau Merkel is running the show. Quick fix solutions, which are what the Euro bureaucrats are offering, only buy time, but they are offering no solution to what is clearly a systemic problem: the completely artificial nature of a 28-member EU.

As for the obvious solution, to give up on the crazy dream of a 28-member EU, it is so absolutely politically unacceptable that it won't even be discussed even while everybody fears it.

## **The EU is on the verge of a social and cultural collapse**

The undeniable reality is as simple as it is stark:

- The EU cannot absorb so many refugees
- The EU does not have the means to stop them

A massive influx of refugees presents a very complex security problem which EU countries are not equipped to deal with. All EU countries have three basic instruments they can use to protect themselves from unrest, disorders, crime or invasions: the special/security services, the police forces, and the military. The problem is that none of these are capable of dealing with a refugee crisis.

The special/security services are hopelessly outnumbered when dealing with a refugee crisis. Besides, their normal target (career criminals, spies, terrorists) are few and far between in a typical wave of refugees. Mostly, refugees consist mostly of families, often extended ones, and while they sometimes include criminal gangs, this is far from always being the case. The problem is that say 10% of the Kosovar refugees are drug dealers - it gives a bad name to all the refugees from Kosovo and the refugees themselves end up being treated like criminals. Finally, special/security services rely very heavily on informants and foreign gangs are hard to infiltrate. They often speak difficult languages which only a few local language specialists master. As a result, most of the time the EU security services are clueless as to how to deal with the security problem presented to them, if only because they lack the personnel and means to keep track of so many people.

In contrast, cops have an advantage of sorts: they are literally everywhere and they typically have a good sense of the "beat on the street". However, their powers are severely limited and they need to get a court order to do most of their work. Cops also mostly deal with local criminals, whereas most refugees are neither local nor criminals. The sad reality is that most of what cops do in a refugee crisis is provide riot police – hardly a solution to anything.

As for the armed forces, the very best they can do is try to help close a border. In some cases, they can assist the police forces in case of civil disturbances, but that's about it.

Thus the various states of the EU neither have the means to lock their borders or deport most refugees nor do they have the means to control them. Sure, there will always be politicians who will make promises about how they are going to send all these refugees back home, but that is a crude and blatant lie. The vast majority of these refugees are fleeing war, famine and abject



poverty and there is no way anybody is going to send them back home.

Keeping them, however, is also impossible, at least in a cultural sense. For all the *doubleplusgoodthinking* propaganda about integrating all races, creeds, and cultures the reality is that there is absolutely nothing the EU has to offer to these refugees to make them want to integrate into it. For all its sins and problems, at least the USA is offering an "American dream" which, false as it might be, still inspires people worldwide, especially the unsophisticated and poorly educated. Not only that, but the US society is largely acultural to begin with. Ask yourself, what is the "American culture" to begin with? If anything, it is really a "melting pot" as opposed to a "tossed salad" – meaning that whatever is tossed in this melting pot loses its original identity while the overall mixture of the pot fails to produce a really indigenous culture, at least not in a European sense of the word.

Europe is or, should I say, used to be radically different from the USA. There used to be real, deep, cultural differences between the various regions and provinces of each European country. A Basque is most definitely not a Catalan; a Marseillais is not a Breton, etc. As for the differences between a German and a Greek – they are simply huge. The result from the current refugee crisis is that all European cultures are now directly threatened in their identity and their lifestyle. This is often blamed on Islam, but the reality is that African Christians don't integrate any better. Neither do the Christian Gypsies, by the way. As a result, clashes happen literally everywhere – in shops, streets, schools, etc. There is not a single country in Europe where these clashes are not threatening the social order. These daily clashes result in crime, repression, violence and the ghettoization of both the immigrants and of the locals which leave their traditional suburbs and move to less immigrant-saturated areas.

[Sidebar: to my American readers who might think “so what? We have ghettos in the USA too”. I will say that what the French call “*zones de non-droit*” (non-law zones) are far worse than anything you would see in the USA. And keep in mind that no country in the EU has the kind of huge, militarized, police forces which every major US city now has. Neither is there the equivalent of the US National Guard. At best, there are anti-riot forces like the French CRS, but they can only do so much.]

The level of aggravation suffered by many, if not most, Europeans directly resulting from this crisis in immigration is hard to describe to somebody who has not seen it. And since voicing such frustrations was considered as “racist” or “xenophobic” by the powers that be (at least until recently – this is progressively changing now), this deep resentment is mostly kept hidden, but it is perceptible nonetheless. And the immigrants most definitely feel it, every day. Again, this is why the notion of a US-style “melting pot” in Europe isn’t happening: the only thing Europe has to offer to all these hundreds of thousands of refugees is a silent hostility fed by fear, outrage, disgust and helplessness. Even those locals who used to be refugees themselves in the past (immigrants from North Africa, for example) are now disgusted and very hostile to the new wave of refugees coming in. And, of course, not a single refugee coming to Europe believes in a “European dream”.

Last but not least, these refugees are a huge burden on the local economies and the social services which were never designed to cope with such an influx of needy “clients”.

For the foreseeable future, the prognosis is clear: more of the same, only worse, possibly much worse.

## **The EU is just a colony of the United States unable to defend her own interests**

The EU is ruled by a class of people which is completely sold off to the United States. The best examples of this sorry state of affairs is the Libyan debacle which saw the US and France completely destroy the most developed country in Africa only to now have hundreds of thousands of refugees cross the Mediterranean and seek refuge from war in the EU. This outcome could have been very easy to predict, and yet the European countries did nothing to prevent it. In fact, all these Obamawars (Libya, Syria, Afghanistan, Iraq, Yemen, Somalia, and Pakistan) have resulted in huge movements of refugees. Add to this the chaos in Egypt, Mali and the poverty all over Africa and you have a mass-exodus which no amount of wall-building, ditch-digging or refugee tear gassing will stop. And if that was not enough, the EU committed what can only be called political and economic suicide by allowing the Ukraine to explode into a major civil war involving 45 million people, a completely destroyed economy and a bona fide Nazi regime in power. That outcome was also easy to predict. But all the Euro bureaucrats did is to impose self-defeating economic sanctions on Russia which ended up providing exactly the kind of conditions needed for the Russian economy to finally diversify and begin producing locally instead of importing everything from abroad.

It might be worth recalling here that after WWII Europe was basically an occupied territory. The Soviets had the central-eastern part while the US/UK had the western part. We all have been conditioned to assume that the people living under the “oppression” of what the US propaganda called the “Warsaw Pact” (in reality called the “Warsaw Treaty Organization”) were less free than those who lived under the “protection” of the North Atlantic

Treaty Organization. Never mind that the term "North Atlantic" was coined deliberately to tie Western Europe to the USA, the central issue here is that while in many ways the folks in the West were, indeed, granted many more freedoms than those in the East; *the US/UK occupied part of Europe never recovered true sovereignty either*. And just as the Soviets carefully nurtured a local *comprador* elite in each East European country, so did the USA in the West. The big difference only appeared in the late 1980s early 1990s when the entire Soviet-run system came crashing down while the US-run system came out reinforced as a result of the Soviet collapse. If anything, since 1991 the US iron grip over the EU became even stronger than before.

The sad reality is simple: the EU is a US colony, run by US puppets who are simply unable to stand up for basic and obvious European interests.

## **The EU is in a deep political crisis**

Up until the late 1980s, there used to be some more or less 'real' opposition 'Left' parties in Europe. In fact, in Italy and France, the Communists almost came to power. But as soon as the Soviet system collapsed, all the European opposition parties either vanished or were rapidly co-opted by the system. And, just as in the USA, former Trotskyists became Neocons almost overnight. As a result, Europe lost the little opposition it had to the AngloZionist Empire and became a 'politically pacified' land. What the French call "*la pensée unique*" or the "single thought" had now triumphed, at least if one judges by the corporate media. Politics had turned into a make believe show where various actors pretend to deal with real issues when in reality all they talk about are invented, artificially created "problems" which they then "solve" (homosexual "marriage" being the perfect example). The only form of

meaningful politics left in the EU is separatism (Scottish, Basque, Catalan, etc.) but so far, it has failed to produce any alternative.

In this brave new world of pretend politics nobody is in charge of real problems which are never tackled directly, but only shoved under the carpet until the next election and that inevitably only worsens everything. As for the EU's AngloZionist overlords, they don't care what happens unless their own interests are directly affected.

You could say that the Titanic is sinking and the orchestra keeps playing, and you would be close to the truth. Everybody hates the Captain and crew, but nobody knows who to replace them with.



# **The Moral Yardstick of the Ukrainian War**

## **(Saker Rant)**

August 31, 2015

I just got home from a 6-hour long trip to take my daughter to college. On the way home, I was alone in the van, driving through the huge Ocala National Forest, and I wanted to listen to some music and just think. While I was going through the 32GB of music on my player I realized that there were two artists whom I used to love but whose music I did not want to listen to: Yuri Shevchuk and Boris Grebenshchikov (aka “BG”). But let me backtrack first and explain.

I love Florida and I am happy here. But my nostalgia for Russia is like an open wound, always open, always hurting. One of the ways I found to transport myself to Russia, if just a little bit, is to listen to Russian music. Sometimes, doing this makes the pain even worse, but often this works like a kind of short-acting anesthetic: I feel like I am at home, amongst my people, where I can let my guard down and just be myself, if only for the duration of a song or two. Truly, this is hard to explain and only an exile can really understand how powerful a song from back home can hit you when you are far, far way, even in a beautiful place. And I have been away for 20 years now...

And yet today, I did not want to listen to my two favorite singers. Something in me told me that it would only hurt, but provide no comfort. Why?

### **First I bash some Russians**

I used to say that one should never conflate the artist and his/her talent with his/her political views. Even during my years of

rabid anti-Communism, I loved to listen to Mercedes Sosa and I still love to listen to Richard Strauss, even though he, unlike Wagner, was, if I am not mistaken, a *bona fide* Nazi. Listening to Bill Evans (my favorite Jazz musician) does not mean that I endorse heroin any more than listening to Bach (my favorite Baroque composer) makes me a Protestant.

And yet I don't want to listen to Shevchuk or BG anymore.

Shevchuk's hatred of Putin is so stupid and so crude that it got him on a very short list (just under 40 names, IIRC) of "Russian friends of the Ukraine" issued by the Ukronazi Junta in Kiev (the list of banned Russian personalities currently includes, IIRC, over 600 names, including Pushkin) . As for BG, he actually traveled to Odessa to join Mikhail Saakashvili for a barbecue party where BG sang for the man.

Now I know that both Shevchuk and BG have fried their brains – Shevchuk pickled his with vodka while BG shrunk his own with LSD and other drugs.

But my problem is not with their brains, it is with their hearts! How do their hearts not tell them that the conflict in the Ukraine is not just 'a conflict', but the *armed expression of the most rabid and hate-filled russophobia ever*? How can they not know, not feel, that even the German Nazis never had so much hatred for Russia in their hearts as the Ukrainian nationalists?! Conversely, how do they not realize that those fighting for the freedom of the Donbass are not just your garden-variety separatists but quite literally modern day heroes who took up arms to resist absolute, genocidal evil?

There is another Russian singer whom I love: Vladimir Vyssotskii (1938-1980) who wrote a beautiful song called the "Ballad about Struggle" in which he describes how when children read books about heroes they always imagine themselves in the role of the hero but that it is important as an adult to really take a

stance against evil. You can check out this song interpreted by a Novorussian soldier with subtitles from Tatzhit here: <http://thesaker.is/novorossiya-militiaman-singing-ballad-of-the-struggle-by-vysotsky-eng-sub/>. I would like to translate just the last part of the song again, not so much in a poetic way (something I am quite unable to do), but in an attempt to convey the key ideas:

*You cannot forever live in dreams  
Fun times do not last very long  
There is so much pain around  
Try to pry open the hands of the dead  
And grab the weapon they hold*

*And see for yourself, having grabbed the still warm sword  
And donned the combat armor  
The true value of things  
Find out for yourself whether you are a hero or a coward  
And experience the real taste of combat*

*If you have never had your meat off a knife  
And if you have just observed it all with your arms crossed  
And if you have never challenged the traitor or the torturer in  
combat  
Then it means that your life was entirely worthless and vain*

*But if you hacked your way with your father's sword  
And if you have swallowed your tears  
And if you have found out the true value of things  
In a real combat  
Then the books you have read as a kid were the right ones.*



I first heard the song when I was 17 and for me, it was clear: my life would be the proof of my own worth and the worth of my upbringing. At that moment I decided that I would not just stand by and observe, but that I would fight evil as soon as I could identify it. True, I was naïve and ignorant, and instead of making my own judgments about what was good and evil, I swallowed the propaganda which was fed to me by my family and the society I lived in. But that desire to stand up for what is right and good and to oppose evil is something which I never lost, even when I understood that the ideals of my youth were wrong.

He read the right books as a kid.

There is a point to this digression and it is this: I believe that no matter how talented artists like Shevchuk and BG are, both their life and their talent are wasted because they missed this key moment in Russia's history: the moment when absolute evil showed its ugly face yet again and attacked. What this also shows to me is the total disconnect between these artists and the people they supposedly take their inspiration from: the Russian people (who support Putin at the 85%+ range). And that is, alas, an old Russian disease.

It is the curse of the Russian people that our (supposed) intelligentsia always feels like it needs to validate itself by opposing the regime in power: to be a “real artist” you just have to be in opposition to whomever is in power – it gives you this special “chic” of a self-declared “conscience of the people”, a sort of “martyr by proxy” where the artist himself is left completely unmolested and lives the good life, but somehow “feels” and “expresses” the sorrow of those (innocent ones, of course!) whom the regime “persecutes”. And Shevchuk fell into that trap. And if that was the full extent of his personal dislike for Putin I would not give a damn about his views. But Shevchuk’s dislike for Putin is so ideologically driven that it follows that whatever Putin does is also,

by definition, bad; even when Putin stands up to the Nazis in Kiev or the AngloZionist Empire. As for BG – his position is even worse. He does not give a damn about “politics” or “governments” at all. Which would be all well and dandy if it wasn't for the fact that others, much less privileged than him, are sacrificing their lives or limbs to oppose evil. And so, indeed:

*And if you have just observed it all with your arms crossed.  
And if you have never challenged the traitor or the torturer in  
combat.  
Then it means that your life was worthless.*

Yehuda Bower put it even more simply:

*Thou shalt not be a victim.  
Thou shalt not be a perpetrator.  
And above all,  
Thou shalt not be a bystander.*

For all their immense talent, Shevchuk and BG completely missed the key moment where their hearts should have told them to take a stand. But their hearts remained silent. And so I don't want to listen to them anymore. And that feeling of not wanting to listen to them is not limited to them.

## **Next, I bash a few American Leftists**

For years I have listened to David Rovics whom I interviewed for this blog and whom I called the “beautiful voice of the American resistance”. His amazing lyrics, always set to beautiful melodies, were, like a breath of fresh air in a country where the

zombification of the general public has reached truly Orwellian levels. Sure, I was baffled how Rovics could clearly not “get it” about 911, but I also realized that he was what I called a “Chomskyite”, i.e., somebody who “unless Chomsky said so” just does not see things. Just like Amy Goodman or the folks at Real News Network. And Chomsky did not “say so”. So Rovics, like a big part of the so-called "progressive" or "liberal" "Left" in the USA, did not know what to make of the conflict in the Ukraine. For the very same reason, Shevchuk got stuck in this own logical fallacy: Putin.

American Liberals and Progressives are stuck because *fundamentally they are still very much part of the system*. Sure, they have disagreements with the Federal Government and with the mainstream politics, but when push comes to shove, they are stuck, unable to really cut their "mental umbilical cord" if you will. The best example of that mental paralysis of the US Liberals/Progressives is their blindness about 911: not only has the controlled demolition of WTC 1, 2, and 7 been proven beyond a reasonable doubt, but *the Federal Government has basically admitted that 911 was an inside job*.

The US government has admitted, through NIST, that WTC7 fell in free fall acceleration for 2.25 seconds. Why is that important? Simply because that means that a number of floors of WTC7 disappeared instantaneously and symmetrically from under the roof of WTC7 (free fall acceleration means no resistance besides air). There is only one possible way to remove a section of a building instantaneously: by explosive power. Yes, the admission by Uncle Sam that WTC7 fell for at least 2.25 seconds is an implicit admission that explosives were used. And since Uncle Sam has admitted that only explosives can explain what was observed on September 11th, Uncle Sam has therefore also admitted that this was a controlled demolition - an ‘inside job as no outside

actor, never mind some semi-mythical 'al-Qaeda' could have had access to a super-secret building like WTC7. Only Uncle Sam could have rigged that building to bring it down in a few seconds.

The problem for the US Liberals/Progressives is that they have to reject this evidence because of its implications: that the US 'deep state' was willing and capable of murdering thousands of innocent US citizens to embark on a series of imperialist wars. That, to a typical US Liberal/Progressive is literally *crimethink* and therefore, totally unacceptable. The more sophisticated members of the US Liberals/Progressives also realized that there was no way that the Administration of "Dubya" Bush could have had the time to rig the towers or, for that matter, to write up the huge Patriot Act. This had to be done long before Dubya got into the White House. So clearly some elements of the Democratic Party were "in on it". Rather than accept the evidence at hand, the Liberals/Progressives preferred to simply look away and pretend like this never happened.

Same thing with Putin: the entire US corporate media and all the talking heads have declared *urbi et orbi* that Putin is a dictator, a tyrant, a dangerous ex-KGB man with a maniacal drive for power. That he is allied to evil and ruthless Russian oligarchs and shadowy "secret service" types who, together, are concocting devious plans to restore the Evil Empire, occupy the Baltics, even possibly Poland, and to bring world civilization and progress to a bloody end. He wants to kill all homosexuals, he threatens to nuke the planet and he wants to be a Czar. He is both the "new Hitler" and the "new Stalin". Having endorsed this load of crap, how could they possibly declare today that Putin is not the cause of the civil war in the Ukraine or that the AngloZionist Empire is supporting bona fide Nazis who use ballistic missiles, multiple rocket launchers and chemical weapons against their own population?

Again, the facts must be wrong therefore they must be rejected.

And so David Rovics, the “beautiful voice of the American Resistance” has literally nothing to say about this war. He is all over Palestine, Ferguson or even Walmart – but a real genocidal Nazi regime in Europe is, apparently, beyond his field of vision.

### **And, in conclusion, I address the “noble Europeans”!**

The European society is as thoroughly purged from any real spirituality as it is filled with dogmas. I won't list them all here – this rant is already too long – but I will only mention the main one: the "Dogma of Dogmas" in Europe is that Nazis are bad, bad, bad, bad!! Very bad. Like really so unspeakably bad, that they are way worse than all the others. The Nazis committed the Crime of Crimes and no civilized European would ever EVER want to have anything to do with those evil, evil, evil, evil Nazis!!

The civilized European is so outraged with the Nazis that he is willing to ban any type of putatively racist speech. He is willing to jail any historian who would dare to question the officially accepted narrative about the so-called “Holocaust” or the obligatory figure attached to it (the Holocaust is the only genocide which has an official figure – 6 million – attached to it under an unspoken but nonetheless mandatory dogma. Try suggesting, say, 5,5 million or, God forbid, even less and you will immediately be suspected of being a Nazi which, as I have mentioned, is bad, bad, bad, bad!!!). And while historians go to jail, the civilized Europeans are sending money and weapons to a REAL Nazi regime in Kiev. For the life of me, I cannot imagine a worse hypocrisy. Apparently, Nazis are only Nazis when they go after Jews. When they go after Russians, they are not "real" Nazis. The anti-Jewish Nazis are bad, bad, bad, bad and bad, but the anti-

Russian Nazis are, apparently, rather good, maybe even "good, good" (only 2x "good" as to not be as good as the anti-Jewish Nazis are bad).

## **The new face of Europe**

So please allow me to be rude here and remind everybody that the majority of "civilized Europeans" did nothing or very little to oppose Herr Hitler and only a minority truly resisted (the strongest resistance was in Serbia and Greece – two countries which nowadays the "rich" Europe is trying hard to destroy). The majority of Europeans did nothing, or again, very little to stop the mass murder of Jews and nor did the Europeans liberate themselves from the Nazi yoke. They were liberated by "Communist Russian hordes" who account for 80% of all the destroyed Nazi military might (the remaining 20% were destroyed by the Anglos, very late in the game). Of all people on the planet, the Europeans ought to be the very last ones to ever show some sympathy for a Nazi regime, especially one focusing its genocidal hatred against the country which reduced the promised "1000 year Reich" to a mere 12 years. Forgive me, my dear Europeans, but if your "anti-Nazism" is reduced to jailing historians while fully siding with Nazi Banderists in Kiev – it is absolutely worthless!

## **The moral yardstick of the Ukrainian war**

These examples all point to the same reality: the war in the Ukraine has turned into a moral yardstick separating those who "*read the right books*" and those who are "*not a bystander*" from those who are, forgive my language, simply full of shit (those offended by my choice of words can replace it with "scatophores" – sounds better, right?).

There are, I suppose, circumstances where one can respect his opponent. But there are also circumstances which make that quite impossible. The civil war in the Ukraine is, at least for me, such a situation. Backing the junta in Kiev – regardless under what pretext – is not only wrong, it is deeply dishonorable. In fact, it is despicable. I don't give a damn about what people think about Putin or, for that matter, about Russia and the Russian people. I really don't! And I can forgive those who were initially confused or ignorant. But too much time has passed; things have become so crystal clear that even the dumbest of ignoramuses has had the time, by now, to connect the dots. And I don't care if you are Russian (like Shevchuk and BG), American or European. If you have anything but total disgust with the evil freak show in Kiev I have nothing but contempt for you.



# Putin and Israel – A Complex and Multi-Layered Relationship

December 23, 2015

The recent murder of Samir Kuntar by Israel (<http://www.presstv.ir/Detail/2015/12/20/442447/Israel-Syria-Hezbollah-airstrike---->)

has, yet again, inflamed the discussion about Putin's relation to Israel. This is an immensely complicated topic and those who like simple, canned, "explanations" should stop reading right now. The truth is, the relationship between Russia and Israel and, even before that, between Jews and Russians would deserve an entire book. In fact, Alexander Solzhenitsyn has written exactly such a book, it is entitled "200 years together", but due to the iron grip of the Zionists on the Anglo media, it has still not been translated into English. That should already tell you something right there – an author acclaimed worldwide who got the Nobel Prize for literature cannot get his book translated into English because its contents might undermine the official narrative about Russian-Jewish relations in general and about the role Jews played in Russian 20th century politics in particular! What other proof of the reality of the subordination of the former British Empire to Zionists interest does one need?

I have already written about this topic in the past and, at the very least, I will ask you to read the following two background articles before continuing to read:

- AngloZionist: Short primer for the newcomers (<http://thesaker.is/anglozionist-short-primer-for-the-newcomers/>)
- How a medieval concept of ethnicity makes NATO commit yet another dangerous blunder



(<http://thesaker.is/how-a-medieval-concept-of-ethnicity-makes-nato-commit-yet-another-a-dangerous-blunder/>)

Before looking into some of the idiosyncrasies of the Russian-Israeli relationship I want to stress one very important thing: you should not simply assume that the relationship between Jews and non-Jews in Russia is similar to what it is in the West. This is not the case. Without going through a detailed discussion of the emancipation of Jews in the West and their long track from their rabbi-run *shtetls* to the boardrooms of the biggest western corporations, I will just say that for Russian Jews this process of emancipation happened in a much more violent and catastrophic way. The second big difference between western Jews and Russian Jews is that roughly between 1917 and 1939 a specific subset of Jews (Bolshevik Jews) was in quasi-total control of Russia. During that period the Bolshevik Jews persecuted Russians and, especially, Orthodox Christians with a truly genocidal hate. This is a fact of history which most Russians are very much aware of, even if this is still considered *crimethink* in most western circles. It is also important to stress here that the Bolshevik Jews persecuted not only Orthodox Christians but all religious groups, including, by the way, Judaics. Putin is very much aware of all these facts which he addressed when speaking to a group of Judaics in Moscow: Vladimir Putin on Jews in Soviet Union government: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7bSAB5OPkwQ>

In the 2nd article mentioned above, I discussed these issues and all I want to do is to show you that *Putin is very much aware of this past* and that he has the courage and intellectual honesty to remind Russian Jews of it.

The other absolutely crucial fact about the relationship between Russia and Israel is the immigration of Russian Jews to

Israel. Here I will just submit to you a bullet-point list of why this is a crucial factor:

1. Regardless of whether they ended up in Israel, Austria, Germany, or the USA, the immigration of Russian Jews to Israel made it possible for those Jews who did not want to stay in Russia to leave. Conversely, those who did not leave stayed by choice. This means that the vast majority, if not all, of the rabid Russophobes and Christianity-hating Jews have left Russia. Those who stayed in Russia did so because they decided that it was their home.
2. A large number (some estimates go as high as 20%) of so-called "Jews" who left Russia are not Jewish at all, including some of those who settled in Israel. The truth is that the economic and social hardships which faced the Soviet society under Brezhnev & Co and Russia under Yeltsin made a lot of non-Jewish Russians to invent themselves some (non-existing) Jewish origins just to emigrate. Thus there are many real Russians, as opposed to Russian Jews, in Israel.
3. As a result of this big immigration, there are innumerable personal ties between individuals and families living in Israel and Russia. This means that when, say, Iraq or Hezbollah rain rockets on Israel, there are folks in Russia who are personally concerned about their friends in Israel *even if they don't necessarily approve of Israeli politics*.
4. The so-called "Russian Mafia" is, in reality, mostly a Mafia of Russian Jews. This is particularly true in the West. In Russia there are Jewish mobsters, but not really a Jewish mob as such. Russian and Jewish mobsters get along famously and that also creates, shall we say, strong "business" ties between "Russian" oligarchs and Israel.

5. Under Yeltsin, the country was de facto ruled by what was called the "semibankirshchina", the "rule of the Seven Bankers"  
(<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Semibankirshchina>).  
These were the seven top bankers of Russia who owned about 50% of the entire Russian economy. All of them except one (Potanin) were Jews.
6. During the Yeltsin years, the vast majority of the members of government and, especially, their advisors were Jews. Jews also were in control of almost all of the mainstream media. To give you an idea of how prevalent this trend was in the 1990s, here is a (machine translated) list of top-level Jews in Yeltsin's Russia I have found on the Internet: (source: <https://goo.gl/jZlazH>)

*The oligarchs were Jews in order to ensure the re-election of Boris Yeltsin in the 1996 presidential election:*

*1991 – 1999*

*Boris Yeltsin (Eltsin – Jew married to a Jew).*

*Naina Yeltsin – a Jew.*

*Adviser to the President on economic issues – Livshits – JEW.*

*During all the time of Yeltsin's rule (1991-1999), the majority of his advisers were Jewish.*

*Head of Presidential Administration Filatov, Chubais, Voloshin, the daughter of the President (a new position of the Jewish authorities), Tatyana Dyachenko (by Jewish law – Halacha, as the daughter of a Jew) .*

## GOVERNMENT

*All key ministers – JEWS:*

*Economy Minister – Yasin – Jew*

*Zam. Minister of Economy – Urinson – Jew*

*The Minister of Finance – Panskov – Jew*

*Zam. Minister of Finance – Vavilov – Jew*

*Chairman of the Central Bank – Paramonov – Jew*

*Minister of Foreign Affairs – Kozyrev – Jew*

*Minister of Energy – Shafranik – Jew*

*Minister of Communications – Bulhak – Jew*

*Minister of Natural Resources – Danilov– Jew*

*Minister of Transport – Efimov – Jew*

*The Minister of Health – Nechayev – Jew*

*Minister for Science – Saltykov – Jew*

*Minister of Culture – Sidorov – Jew*

*mass media*

*Chairman of the Media – Rodents – Jew*

## PRESS

*“News” – Golembiovskiy – Jew*

*“Komsomolskaya Pravda” – Fronin – Jew*

*“Moskovsky Komsomolets” – Gusev (Drabkin) – Jew*

*“Arguments and Facts” – Starks – Jew*

*“Work” – Potapov – Jew*

*“Moscow News” – Karpinski – Jew*

*“Kommersant” – Yakovlev (Ginsburg) – Jew*

*“New Look” – Dodolev – Jew*

*“Nezavisimaya Gazeta” – Tretyakov – Jew*

*“Evening Moscow” – Lisin – Jew*

*“Literary Newspaper” – Udaltsov – Jew*

*“Publicity” – Izyumov – Jew*

*“Interlocutor” – Kozlov – Jew*

*“Rural Life” – Kharlamov – a Jew.*

*“Top Secret” – Borovik – Jew.*

*Television and radio:*

*TV and Radio, “Ostankino” – A. Yakovlev – a Jew. Russian TV and Radio Company – Popov – Jew.*

*1996-1999 GG – “Seven bankers”.*

*All Russian finance concentrated in the hands of the Jews.*

*A country ruled by seven bankers (“seven bankers”):*

- 1. Aven – Jew*
- 2. Berezovsky – a Jew,*
- 3. Gusinsky – a Jew,*
- 4. Potanin (Potanin on different data).*
- 5. Smolensk – Jew*
- 6. Friedman – a Jew,*
- 7. Khodorkovsky – a Jew.*
- 8. Roman Abramovich*

The lists of Jews in the Soviet government from 1917-1939 looks exactly similar. You can find them on the Internet yourselves.

In truth, folks who compile such lists are rarely motivated by purely scientific purposes and they often don't feel constrained by strict rules of evidence. So it is quite possible that a certain percentage of “Jews” listed above are not Jews at all. But even with a wide margin of error – you get the picture. Just as between 1917 and 1939, between 1991 and 1999 the reins of power in Russia were firmly in Jewish hands, and in both cases, with truly catastrophic consequences. *The big difference is that if in the early 20th century the Jews in power were ideological opponents of the Anglo Empire, in*

*the late 20th century the Jews in Russia were practically an extension of the AngloZionist Empire.*

Speaking of extensions of the AngloZionist Empire; I have already explained many times in the past that the candidature of Putin to succeed Yeltsin was a compromise reached between the Russian security services and Russian "big money" who pushed Medvedev as a counterweight to Putin. I usually refer to the forces backing Putin as "Eurasian Sovereignists" and the forces backing Medvedev as "Atlantic Integrationists". The goal of the former is to fully sovereignize Russia and make her a key element in a multi-polar but unified Eurasian continent while the goal of the latter is to be accepted by the AngloZionist Empire as an equal partner and to integrate Russia into the Western power structures. Next is something so important that I will single it out on a separate paragraph:

**The Atlantic Integrationists are still in full control of the Russian financial and banking sector, of all the key economic ministries and government positions, they control the Russian Central Bank and they are, by far, the single biggest threat to the rule of Putin and those supporting him. Considering that roughly 90% of Russians now support Putin, that means that these Atlantic Integrationists are the single biggest threat to the Russian people and Russia as a whole.**

How is that all linked to Israel? Simple! *Putin inherited a system created by and for the AngloZionist Empire.* He was a compromise candidate between two radically opposed parties and it took him years to first get rid of most of the Russian (Jewish) oligarchs and then, very gradually, begin the cleanup process in

which slowly, step by step, the Zionists were booted out of their positions of power. According to Mikhail Khazin, the balance between these two groups has only recently reached a 50/50 point of (unstable) equilibrium. That also means that the "Putin people" need to watch their back every day the Good Lord makes because they know that their so-called "colleagues" are willing to stab them in a blink of an eye as soon as they get an opportunity.

I happen to think that the rumors of a coup in Russia are greatly exaggerated. Not only because Putin does enjoy the support of the "power ministries" (Defense, State Security, Internal Affairs, etc.) but, much more importantly, because of the support he has with 90% of the Russian people. To overthrow a man with such a cult-like following, a man truly loved by the vast majority of people, would be too dangerous. But that does not mean that the 5th column is not willing to sabotage every effort by Putin and his supporters.

The truth is that Putin has been forced to compromise many, many times. Here are just a few examples:

**The oligarchs:** when Putin ridded Russia of the *semibankirshchina* he did not really crack down on all the oligarchs as such. He only got rid of those oligarchs who, like Khodorkovsky, had tried to basically stage a coup against Putin by buying the entire Duma. The oligarchs were told, "Stay out of politics and I will leave you alone". The deal is still on today.

**The economy:** even in his last speech, Putin had to declare that he fully supports the Central Bank and the Economic Ministers of the Medvedev government. Considering that literally ALL Putin allies openly and vocally are screaming bloody murder about the way the Russian economy is mismanaged, this is clearly a coerced statement and not something he believes in. By the way, I am observing a systematic vilification campaign on the central Russian TV channels against the Central Bank and the Economic

Ministers and this cannot be a coincidence. I predict that Putin is preparing a purge of these circles, but that he needs to line up all his ducks in a row before taking action, especially by inflaming the public opinion against them. Right now the Russian economy is still run by IMF-stooges, by "Washington consensus" types, hence their crazy policy on interest rates, on buying US obligations, on keeping inflation low, etc. etc. etc. Putin, by conviction, is not what I would call a "socialist" but he is most definitely a proponent of "social markets" and somebody who is trying hard to decouple Russia from the Western financial system, and not play by the rules of the Empire.

**Foreign policy:** right up until Putin's latest re-election when finally Russia began to have a fairly consistent foreign policy, the policy of Russia has been one of zigs followed by zags. This was especially true during the times when Medvedev was in charge of the Presidency and when Iran and Libya were betrayed by Russia at the United Nations Security Council (UNSC); something Putin openly called "stupid".

**Personalities:** remember the hyper-corrupt Minister of Defense Serdiukov? Guess what? He has still not been formally charged with anything. Even the woman he did most of his dirty dealing with still lives in her luxurious apartment in Moscow. What does this tell us? That even when Putin got the hard proof of Serdiukov's malfeasance he had enough power to replace him by Shoigu, but not enough power to stick such high-profile "Atlantic Integrationists" into jail.

**Nazi-occupied Ukraine:** Putin had enough control over the government to provide the vital Voentorg and to even send some special forces and artillery strikes across the border to help the Novorussians, but he could not force the economic Ministries to use the Russian economic might to strangle the Ukrainian economy. This resulted in Russia sending artillery shells across the



border in Saur Mogila and (basically free) energy across the border to Kiev.

**Russophobic propaganda:** when recently some third-rate sports journalist, Alexei Andronov, posted a viciously anti-Russian comment on Twitter he was criticized by Alexei Pushkov, a journalist who is also the head of the foreign-affairs committee in the State Duma on his own TV show "Postscriptum". The TV channel which airs the show, TV Tsentr, censored the segment criticizing Andronov. Then, the famous Russian movie director Nikita Mikhailkov recorded an entire show discussing this event, the TV channel running his show, TV Rossia, also censored the entire episode. As for the director of the TV channel where Andronov works, Tina Kandelaki, she gave Andronov her full support. Bottom line: while Putin did immensely improve the overall quality of the Russian media, the Russophobes are still very influential and can spew their hateful venom in total impunity.

I could continue to list example after example, but I think you get the idea: Putin is a very good man in charge of a very bad system.

Now let's really get back to Syria, Hezbollah and the murder of Samir Kuntar.

**First**, consider that the decision to militarily intervene in the Syrian war was already a controversial one. Putin pulled this one off by doing two things: explaining to the Russian people that it was better to deal with the terrorists "there" (in Syria) rather than "here" (in Russia) and by promising that he would not send in ground forces. When Daesh and the Turks fulfilled the promise made by Obama and Biden and blew a Russian airliner and, later, an SU-24 bomber out of the sky, the Russian public continued to support Putin, but most Russians, including myself, were acutely aware of the dangers of the situation. At the end of the day, it is

Putin's personal "street cred" which allowed him to stay the course in spite of real fears.

**Second**, it is clear that Putin and Netanyahu struck a deal when the latter traveled to Moscow: the Israelis don't interfere in Russian operations in support of the Syrians as long as the Russians don't interfere in the combat operations between Israel and Hezbollah. This made it possible for both sides to pursue their main interest even if it was at the cost of their secondary objectives. You don't like that deal and you question its morality? Good! So do I. I am, in fact, intensely uncomfortable with it, but I expect no less from ruthless realpolitik practitioners like Putin and Bibi Netanyahu (good thing you and I are not in power!).

There is, by the way, another precedent which I am just as uncomfortable with: the Russian total backing for the Egyptian military's bloody repression against the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt. I accept the argument that to support the Egyptian military made sense in the context of the war in Syria, but the ethics of supporting such a regime intensely bothers me. This is why Putin is a ruthless but successful politician and I am a little quasi-irrelevant blogger: it takes a ruthless bear to fight ruthless wolves.

This being said, let's not pretend like Hezbollah is any less cynical when needed. I remind you all that when Imad Mugniyeh was murdered in Damascus by the very same Israelis in an operation which could only have been executed with very high-level accomplices in the Assad regime, Hezbollah promised "retaliation" but never peeped a single word against the regime. Neither did Hezbollah have any objections when Assad was torturing Muslims on behalf of the US CIA for the infamous "rendition" program.

As for Putin, he simply has other priorities than to protect Hezbollah or fight Israel:

Surviving inside Russia and not being overthrown by the still very powerful Zionist Power Configuration (to use James Petras' expression) being a top one. Another priority would be not to give his (internal and external) enemies the political argument that "Russia is attacking Israel". Not having a shooting match with Israel and not to have the small and isolated Russian contingent have to fight on two fronts would be crucial too. Ditto not to be accused of having the Russian contingent turned into the *de-facto* "Hezbollah Air Force" like the US is the "Daesh Air Force". These are all obvious priorities for Putin.

And then this: while the Russian S-400s can easily shoot down any Israeli aircraft, the Russian Airspace contingent does not have the material means to fight Israel or, even less so, NATO and CENTCOM. As for Russia, she most definitely cannot pick a fight with Israel, not due to the inherent power of this tiny Zionist Entity, but due to the fact that the US Empire has been thoroughly taken under Zionist control. So those Americans who now complain that Putin "does not have the courage" to take on Israel should first ask themselves how it is that Israel seems to have transformed the USA and Europe into a voiceless Zionist protectorate and what they are doing to liberate themselves from that yoke!

Speaking of the West: one ought to compare the position of the AngloZionist Empire on one hand, and of many influential Russian Jews (in Russia and in Israel) about the war in the Ukraine. While the West has been in total support of the Nazi regime in Kiev, many Russian Jews, especially the very famous ones like Vladimir Soloviev, have taken a categorically anti-Nazi position. And while in Israel the popularity of Putin and Russia is still extremely low (<http://www.pewglobal.org/files/2015/08/Pew->

Research-Center-Russia-Image-Report-FINAL-August-5-2015.pdf), most of the anti-Putin opposition in Russia is not formed of Jews. Finally, the Russian general public is, sadly, extremely poorly informed of the horrors perpetrated by the Zionist regime against the Palestinian people while Israelis and dual-nationals (like Evgenii Satanovskii or Avigdor Eskin) are constantly peddling the notion that "we Russians and Israelis are the only ones standing up to Muslim terrorism" thereby capitalizing to the max on the current war between Russia and Daesh. In other words, Putin would have one hell of a tough time selling the shooting down of an Israeli aircraft to the Russian general public.

I understand that none of the above will have any traction with bona fide Jew-haters or with those who like simple black and white arguments. For them, Putin will forever remain a sellout, an eternal *shabbos-goy* or a puppet of the international financiers. Frankly, I am not addressing this to them. But there are those who are sincerely bewildered and confused about Russian policies which do appear to be confusing or even contradictory. To them I will conclude by saying this:

Putin advances his cause one step at a time and he knows how to wait and let events take on their own dynamic. He is also acutely aware that he is literally fighting with one hand tied behind his back and the other one busy defending against external and internal enemies (the latter being far more dangerous) at the same time. I am sure that Putin fully realizes that, at least potentially, his policy of resistance, sovereignization and liberation can lead to an intercontinental nuclear war and that Russia is currently still weaker than the AngloZionist Empire. Just as in the times of Stolypin, Russia desperately needs a few more years of peace to develop herself and fully stand up. This is most definitely not the time for a frontal confrontation with the Empire. Russia vitally

needs \*peace\* and \*time\*: peace in the Ukraine, peace in Europe and, yes, peace in the Middle-East. Alas, the latter is not an option and, when cornered, Putin did take the decision to go to war. And I am absolutely and categorically certain that if the Empire attacks Russia (from Turkey or elsewhere), Russia will fight back. Russia is willing to go to war if needed, but she will do her utmost to avoid it. This is the price Russia pays for being the weaker side. The good news is that Russia is getting stronger with every passing day, while the Empire is getting weaker. And the power of the AngloZionists and their 5th column in Russia is also weakening with every passing day. But this process will take time.

The big event to watch for is a crackdown on the Central Bank and the economy ministries of the government. Everybody in Russia is waiting for this, Putin even got directly asked this question recently, but he is still denying it all and saying that he fully supports these saboteurs. Considering Putin's track, it is plain stupid to say that he really supports them – this is clearly a delaying tactic until the time is right.

Make no mistake. There is no big love between Russia and Israel. But neither is there a lot of hostility, at least not on the Russian side. ***Most Russians are aware of the ugly role Jews already played twice in Russian history, but this does not translate into the kind of hostility towards Jews which you would see, for example, in the Ukraine.*** At most Russians can be suspicious of Jewish \*power\* but rarely does this translate into hostility for Jews as regular people. Some of the most adored Russian public figures, like the bard Vladimir Vysotskii, had Jewish blood. Most Russians also make a distinction between "their" Jews (Russophobic Jews in the West) and "our" Jews (Russian Jews who love Russia). But since Russophobia has also been widespread amongst Russian elites, before and after the Revolution, it can hardly be described as a Jewish phenomenon. The Russian culture

has always been multi-national and multi-ethnic, does not really separate people by their ethnicity, but judges them much more readily by their actions and ideas. For all these reasons, the hatred of the "Yid" is much more a Ukrainian nationalist phenomenon than a Russian one.

And while most Russians would not want to have a return to power of a new version of the Bolshevik commissars or the "democratic" oligarchs inside Russia, there is closeness and an anti-Nazi solidarity between Russians and Israelis which should not be dismissed.

Concerning Palestine, Russia will support all the relevant UN Resolutions and thus be the typical and rather unimaginative "two-state solution" proponent. At most, Russia will "deplore" or "regret" the abuses of Palestinians by Israelis, but Russia will never become a systematic defender of Palestinian rights like Iran or Hezbollah simply because the future of Palestine is not a Russian priority.

I hope that the above is helpful in understanding why Russia does not take any action to protect Hezbollah against the Israelis (and why she will not prevent Hezbollah from retaliating from Syria, should Hezbollah take that decision). Simply put: there is no compelling internal or external reason for Russia to get directly involved in this while there are plenty of compelling internal and external reasons for Russia to stay out. If in the past the USSR supported the PLO on both ideological and geostrategic reasons, modern Russia today will not follow the same paradigm. Besides, it's not like Fatah or Hamas are attractive, or even credible, partners for Russia, being in bed as they are with Daesh. Ditto for the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt.

As for Hezbollah, it is not like they need Russia's protection. Symbolic as they may be, the murders of Imad Mugniyeh or Samir Kuntar will in no way weaken the Resistance. In fact, if the history

of the murder of Abbas al-Musawi teaches us anything, it is that sometimes Israelis murder a Hezbollah leader only to find out that the next one is even a more formidable adversary. God willing, this will also be the case this time.



# A Few Disjointed Thoughts on the Events in Cologne

January 11, 2016

Dear friends,

What I want to share with you today is most definitely not a comprehensive analysis of the events which took place recently in Germany, but rather a few unconnected thoughts and memories that came to mind when I heard about what had happened. So here we go.

First, the figures are staggering: according to Russian sources, there have been over seven hundred assaults in Cologne, 40% of which were sexual (the rest began as "regular" assaults, robberies, battery, etc.). There is mounting evidence that this was a coordinated attack organized through the social media.

There is a big difference between excusing and explaining. I **don't intend to excuse anything**, but I do want to contribute at least a possible and partial explanation to what happened. I have traveled a lot in my life, including to countries with strong social and moral traditions (I think of Indonesia, Thailand, the Maghreb, Greece, Turkey, Palestine, etc.) and in all those places I have seen European women acting with total and utter disrespect for the local people and traditions: going topless on beaches, climbing on top of funeral pyres to take photos of themselves in bikinis, getting drunk and having sex with local men, etc. This might sound very offensive to some, but I am sorry to inform you that European (White) women are seen like tramps/whores/sluts in most of the world. That is simply a fact.



The fact that EVERY western modern movie HAS to have at the very least one sex scene just reinforces this image, as does the huge production of the western porn industry. Even following the events in Cologne, this “lady” decided that going around naked was a proper reply:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=s4vfXOJbIbs>

I am sorry to break this to those who thought otherwise, but *if you have no respect for yourself you will not get respect from others.*

Now let’s talk about Islam.

Many years ago, while in college, I used to work in the summers as a professional driver in Switzerland during big United Nations (U.N.) conferences. One day I got a Saudi general, his wife and 3 kids as clients. I was very apprehensive as I knew that Saudis had a terrible reputation amongst drivers: they would drink, demand that drivers procure them prostitutes (from Milan), be rude and generally repugnant. I was ready to send this one to hell, but to my surprise “my” Saudi turned out to be a very gentle and kind man, a very pious Muslim who would pray and glorify God many times every day, a loving father and husband. First, he was a little distant, but as soon as he learned that I was not a “crusader” but an Orthodox Christian, he invited me to his table and introduced me to this wife and kids. We had a great time together and during five wonderful days, I toured them all over Switzerland and had many hours of very interesting conversations. We parted as friends.

His wife turned out to be a very interesting woman too. She had a Masters in English from, I think, UCLA, and she was a very articulate and educated woman. I used this great opportunity to ask her about what her opinion was about the status of women in Saudi Arabia. As we were talking we were taking a stroll, with her husband and kids, through a park near the Lake of Geneva. As we were walking we saw a couple lying in the grass: the girl was on her

back, her legs spread, and the guy as on top of her and they were passionately kissing. The Saudi lady looked at this pair with complete disgust and told me "*whatever else we do wrong in my country, at least we don't treat women like that*". I could only agree with her.

Nowadays, both in Europe and in the USA, the fashion for boys seems to be coming out of prisons and jails: hence the falling down pants (in jail they take away your belts, so your pants sag down). For girls, apparently, prostitutes are the fashion model to emulate. Now, I know, freedom and all that and, frankly, I personally don't care and it does not bother me (my wife and daughter, obviously, don't dress like that, in fact, they don't even wear pants). But, again, you know the expression: "*If it looks like a duck, swims like a duck, and quacks like a duck, then it probably is a duck*", right?

What if it looks like a prostitute, dresses like a prostitute and acts like a prostitute?

Again, *if you have no respect for yourself you will not get respect from others*. Just as an illustration, not a proof of anything, take a look at this video and come to your own conclusions:

10 Hours of Walking in NYC as a Woman in Hijab:

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?time\\_continue=6&v=mgw6y3cH7tA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=6&v=mgw6y3cH7tA)

Now, before I get the usual chorus of outraged protests from feminists and secularists, let me immediately say that none of what I wrote above in any way excuses what happened in Germany. Nor am I blaming all western women for anything. But what I am saying is that *the kind of behavior which is considered "normal" in the West makes it easy for those who organized the events in Germany to convince poorly educated and generally uncivilized*

*refugees (as opposed to better educated and civilized ones, of course) that women (and men!) in the West deserve no respect.*

Another myth which has to be broken is the naïve notion that refugees are grateful to the countries which give them asylum. This is plainly not so. For many years I worked as an interpreter for the Swiss Federal authorities and I have participated in numerous interviews of refugees and I can attest that the vast majority absolutely despise the country they are asking to grant them asylum. There are several reasons for that. First, the vast majority of refugees are not political refugees, but economic ones. What they want is a share of the pie, of what they imagine to be the wealthy lifestyle of the West. Second, many refugees are from the underclass and even criminal world from the countries they left: usually petty thugs who fled their country's jails. Third, since they very much feel the hostility and condescension of the local people, the asylum seekers return it in kind. Fourth, these "refugees" have no respect (or fear) at all from the local cops whom they consider as ridiculous clowns, especially when compared to the kind of police they would be dealing with in their own country. As for the local jails, they are often more comfortable than the homes they have left behind. Last but not least, refugees are mostly miserable, lonely, alienated and depressed and they have a lot of a lot of pent-up anger and frustration. All this is a toxic mix which can result in all sorts of criminal behavior.

By the way, the security services in the West have known all that for years. For example, in Switzerland, I participated in many command-staff exercises inspired by the 1992 Rodney King riots in Los Angeles

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1992\\_Los\\_Angeles\\_riots](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1992_Los_Angeles_riots)) except that the scenario we worked on was mass rioting of refugees coming from the south. Our exercises assumed that thousands of refugees would begin rioting in several cities at the same time

overwhelming the local police forces and requiring the mobilization of military forces to restore order and protect the population and to close down the normally highly permeable national borders. I am sure that such scenarios were also looked at, if not actually rehearsed, by most European countries. And, if given the freedom to intervene, I am quite sure that the German cops could have gotten the situation under control. I even suspect that the German security services must have seen clear indicators and warnings of what was about to happen. The problem is that it is the political authorities which, yet again, proved to be totally sold out to ideological priorities and totally indifferent to the suffering of their own people.

All this tells me one thing: Europe is completely morally and intellectually bankrupt. We often hear of a so-called “European civilization” or “European values”, but this is total nonsense. If modern Europe did have some real civilizational values it would have been able to deal with this refugee crisis. Heck, I would argue that if Europe even had any real values this entire crisis would not have happened to begin with, simply because the EU would not have been such a willing accomplice in the grand US scheme to destabilize all of the Maghreb and Mashriq. Just like a healthy body can deal with trauma and infection which would be devastating to a body infected with HIV, so can a healthy society deal with much bigger problems than the ones currently facing Europe, but that requires an intellectual, moral and spiritual “immune system” – something which Europe today *completely lacks*.

What Europe desperately needs now is regime change. And I don't mean "regime" in a bad sense at all, I mean that in the sense of "system" change. Just like the USA, by the way. Both in the USA and Europe, the political system is rotten to the core, and it makes no sense to put a different, potentially marginally better person in

charge of a terminally bad system or regime. Northern Europeans used to look down on their southern neighbors, but now they too are directly affected by the chaos resulting from a completely dysfunctional political system: from Greece to Norway – chaos is everywhere.

As for the immigration problem, I think that it is a done deal and nothing will stop it. "White" Europe is gone - history. Those political parties who promise to stop or reverse that flow are simply lying to their electorate. Yes, sure, some politician could, once in power, close the "front door" by more or less "plugging" the main "holes" which allow immigrants to come in, but they will simply continue to come in through the back door (I could write an entire article just about that). You can compare this situation to the pathetic "war on drugs" which is also another utterly futile attempt to deal with an "osmotic pressure" way too big to be tackled by any border or laws. In both cases, the social and economic pressure is so huge that nothing will be able to stop it (and if you believe in capitalist economics, then the explanation is even simpler: it is simply an issue of supply and demand: since the price of entry will always be lower than the demand, the supply will always provide the goods).

There is a certain karmic elegance, I suppose, in Europe being finally conquered by those which it subjected to its imperialist and colonialist policies (and wait until the Ukrainians begin coming in really big numbers!). But that is only so in the abstract. In reality, innocent people on both sides are suffering because of events unleashed by their common enemy – the AngloZionist plutocracy which runs the Empire. As long as this crucial fact remains unspeakable and, therefore, unspoken, the crisis will continue and the victims will continue to attack each other instead of turning against their common enemy. This is why no matter how hard it will be to defend this position, I will always personally be a

proponent of an alliance between Europeans and immigrants against those who seek to destroy the European continent, the Maghreb, and the Mashriq. The Wahabi crazies in Syria, the immigrant thugs in Cologne, the Kosovar Mafia, the neo-Nazis in Germany (and the Ukraine), the Turkish “Grey Wolves” ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grey\\_Wolves\\_organization](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grey_Wolves_organization)) *they are all tools in the hands of the same master* who simply seeks to divide and rule. The good news is that all these forces are always composed of a minority of thugs and that always leaves at least the possibility of uniting the decent and honest people in defense of their common interests.



# Israel vs Iran: Israel Loses \*Big\* Time

January 19, 2016

Today I have already posted two excellent analyses of the (possibly temporary) failure of the USA to submit Iran to its will: one by Alexander Mercouris, (<http://thesaker.is/iran-versus-us-iran-wins/>) the other by Soraya Sepahpour Ulrich. (<http://thesaker.is/the-day-after/>) I shall not repeat their very arguments here, mainly because both see this as a conflict between the USA and Iran, whereas I see it as a conflict between Israel and Iran in which Israel attempted, but failed, to get the USA to fight on its behalf. This is also, albeit to a lesser degree, a conflict opposing the House of Saud by Iran and the KSA is the other big loser here. But first, let us look at the real causes of this confrontation.

First and foremost, I have never accepted the theory that the reason behind this was some kind of Iranian military nuclear program. While there is no doubt that Iran has been trying to master a host of nuclear technologies for many years, and while some of them could conceivably be used for military purposes, I am absolutely convinced that the US/Israeli lobby and the Neocons have used this as a pretext to trigger a confrontation between Iran and the USA. Why do I say that? For two reasons:

First, there has never been any real evidence of an Iranian military nuclear program, but even more important is the fact that Iran never had any need for nuclear weapons. A lot of anti-Iranian propaganda is directly predicated on the notion that having nuclear weapons is highly desirable, yields some big advantage, and that all nations would want to acquire them. This is utter nonsense. In reality, possessing a few nuclear devices would only turn these devices into high priority targets for destruction by the

USA and/or Israel. And even if, by some miracle, the Iranians managed to hide these devices while deploying them on missiles or aircraft, using any one such device would guarantee a massive retaliation from the Empire. What is the point of having a few nukes when Israel has hundreds? Finally, the Iranian Supreme Leader, Ali Khamenei, has declared many times that nuclear weapons are forbidden for Iran because they are un-Islamic. But we are so used to being ruled by lying politicians that we have apparently lost the ability to imagine that any leader would actually speak the truth, be guided by his conscience or, even less so, his faith. So we just dismissed it all.

Second, the threat which Iran really poses to Israel (and the KSA) is not a nuclear one – it is a **civilizational** one. Think of it:

Iran is an **Islamic Republic** and the only country on the planet which has dared to **openly defy both Israel and the USA**. Not only that, it also represents a **radically different model of Islam than the one of the Saudi Wahabis**. Iran is a country which has managed to **survive a war unleashed against it by the joint efforts of the USA, the Soviet Union, France and Iraq, which prevailed against the most powerful Baathist ruler of the Middle-East**, and which then proceeded to **survive economically and politically in spite of decades of crippling sanctions** imposed by all the industrialized countries on the planet. Furthermore, and in contrast to all the Arab and Muslim countries out there, **Iran is the only one which has always truly supported the Palestinian cause** and which has provided **crucial backing for the most formidable national liberation movement on the planet: Hezbollah**. So yes, Iran is very, very dangerous for Israel and for the Saudis.

This is why since roughly 2002 the usual cabal of US deep state actors, the Neocons, the Israeli lobby, the Israelis themselves and, of course, the Saudis have embarked on a massive campaign



to force Iran to its knees and to give in to totally ridiculous demands which go way beyond what the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) mandates (note: while Iran has always been a member in good standing of the NPT, Israel has never agreed to become a member; but then, Israel is not a “rogue state” but the “only democracy in the Middle-East”, right?).

Then things began acquiring their own momentum: if the Empire and Israel had decreed that Iran must either comply or be turned into ruins (economically or militarily) then this absolutely must happen. But, of course, it did not. So breaking Iran soon became a goal in itself: to prove that nobody can defy the AngloZionists and survive. Iran, of course, not only survived but prospered. And thanks to the fantastically short-sighted policies of the USA and Israel, Iran actually managed to *increase* its influence in the region, especially after the US invasion of Iraq. Not only has Iran become a key player in Iraq, but thanks to the “Divine Victory” of Hezbollah against the “invincible Tsahal”, in 2006 Iran also became the ally and patron of the only military force in the region to have single-handedly defeated the Zionist state.

As for the Saudis, they are terrified of this Russian-Iranian-Hezbollah coalition which, they believe, is threatening them, and their anti-Shia crusade in Bahrain, Yemen, Syria, Lebanon, and Iraq. The Saudis also fear the fact that Iran is the proof that an Islamic state does not have to be a backward, primitive and oppressive regime, but that Islam, modernity, and people-power can coexist and be successfully combined (hence the failure of the CIA-backed Iranian elites to overthrow the Islamic Republic during the "Gucci Revolution").

It is therefore not surprising that the Israelis and Saudis are absolutely livid at the agreement negotiated between Iran and the P5+1. For these two countries, the lifting of sanctions against Iran, even combined with the imposition of new, “mini-sanctions” by

the USA, represents the failure of over a decade of sustained anti-Iranian efforts.

This is now the 2nd time that Obama has agreed to basically exchange something against nothing: the first time around, Obama had to cancel a US attack against Syria in exchange for the (costly) destruction of *utterly useless* Syrian chemical weapons, and now Obama is lifting sanctions in exchange for the monitoring of a *non-existent* Iranian military nuclear program. The Israelis fully understand that, and it is no wonder that they hate Obama with a passion.

I sure hope that I am wrong, but I cannot conceive of the Israelis or Saudis simply accepting this situation. There is no way the Zionist and Wahabi crazies will allow Iran to successfully humiliate them and continue to prosper and grow right in their "backyard" (from their point of view, of course).

In purely military terms, neither Israel nor the KSA have what it takes to successfully attack Iran, never mind defeating it. The Israelis were not even capable of controlling a minor Lebanese town right across their own border (Bint Jbeil) even though they tried for 33 days. As for the insanely wealthy Saudis who can't even defeat the dirt-poor Houthis in Yemen. If anything, the KSA and Israel are the proof that neither money nor expensive high-tech hardware is what builds a strong military force. Compare them with the Iranians who are *the folks who trained Hezbollah!* Q.E.D.

As for the US armed forces, they are overstretched, overcommitted and barely holding on to a few positions in Iraq and Afghanistan, and they don't have what it takes to fight Iran either, at least not on the ground. And, let's be honest here, the US armed forces are much better at organizing high-visibility "PR drives" (literally) involving a few APCs and Humvees in the Baltics, the Ukraine, and Poland than at fighting a determined

enemy. So even if most Presidential candidates now speak about "confronting Russia", the reality is that the US cannot do much more than bombing a country like Serbia, and even that took the full support of NATO air forces and ended up in an abject failure (at least from the purely military point of view).

This is why the Empire will have to turn to its traditional set of dirty tricks: false flags, support for various terrorist groups, subversion of the Islamic Republic by means of the local money elites, sabotage, "human rights" campaigns (à la Neda) ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Death\\_of\\_Neda\\_Agha-Soltan](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Death_of_Neda_Agha-Soltan)), support for "gay rights", arming of separatists groups, etc.

But, at least for the time being, this is a huge victory for Iran and an equally huge defeat for Israel: the poor Zionists have now been robbed of not one, but two wars they wanted so badly, and even their "success" in Libya is not enough of a consolation. I can hear the desperate "oy vey" shouts even from here :-)

Since this is a great day for Iran, I leave you with a beautiful song written by the Iranian rapper Yas in reaction to the release of the US propaganda movie 300 (see the translated lyrics below). Enjoy!

### **My Identity**

Listen. I want to tell you my intent  
They want to erase my identity  
The history of the land of the Aryans  
Is screaming until we come to it  
So now is the time for you to hear  
Iran is my land the  
The country which after 7000 years  
Is still standing  
And the hearts of Iranians — still like the sea  
Hear this, my fellow Iranian, from YAS

I too for my land stand like a soldier  
Hold Iran like a gem in your hand and say  
My complaint will burst out like a shot  
Let's stand together and sing our anthem  
My sisters, my brothers, my fellow Iranians  
Iran's civilization is in danger  
All of us are soldiers beneath our flag  
We won't let anyone spread lies about us  
For us Iranians it is our calling  
That we wear the symbol of 'Farvahar' around our necks  
Our unity against an enemy is the cause of their distress  
Iran's name for us is an honor  
And our respect for her is like a thorn in eye for those  
Who want to injure her

CHORUS:

- Like the thirst of a seed [wheat] for water
- Like the dampness of rain, the smell of earth
- Like you, pure eyes, like the feeling of its earth, for you
  - My land. Singing for you is in my heart
  - Singing of my land, is my feeling
- My love - the earth of this land — Iraaaan.

You want to say that we came from generations of Barbarians?  
So take a look then to Takht Jamshid!  
You're showing Iran's name in vein  
So yours could be written big on a cover of a CD [DVD]?  
I'm writing down your intentions in my book  
I know why you wrote this film "300"  
I know that your heart is made of stone and lead  
Instead of using your art to make a culture of peace  
In this sensitive air and bad atmosphere

You want to start fishing in murky waters [profiting]  
But this I tell you in its original language  
Iran will never be spoiled and surrendered  
God has given you two eyes to see  
Take a look and read the books written by  
Saadi and Ibn-e-Sina, Ferdosi, Khayam or Molana Rumi  
Always throughout history we were the start [on top]  
But now YAS can't sit down quietly  
Let Iran's name be marred by a few tricksters  
I'll shred your intentions with the "razor of hope"  
Who are YOU to speak of the history of Iran?

– CHORUS –

It was Cyrus The Great that started the peace  
Freeing the Jewish from the grip of Babylon  
Cyrus The Great wrote the first bill of human rights  
That is why I carry my esteem and great pride  
For my Iran. The history of my land  
For the earth of this land which my body is from  
Whatever part of the world you live my fellow Iranian  
And till your blood flows through you  
Don't allow yourself to be satisfied  
That anyone can fool around with your heritage  
The history of Iran is my identity  
Iran — protecting your name is my good intent



# Putin's Biggest Failure

January 24, 2016

Whatever happens in the future, Putin has already secured his place in history as one of the greatest Russian leaders ever. Not only did he succeed in literally resurrecting Russia as a country, but in a little over a decade he brought her back as a world power capable of successfully challenging the AngloZionist Empire. The Russian people have clearly recognized this feat and, according to numerous polls, they are giving him an amazing 90% support rate. And yet, there is one crucial problem which Putin has failed to tackle: the real reason behind the apparent inability of the Kremlin to meaningfully reform the Russian economy.

As I have described in the past many times, when Putin came to power in 1999-2000 he inherited a system completely designed and controlled by the USA. During the Yeltsin years, Russian ministers had much less power than western 'advisers' who turned Russia into a US colony. In fact, during the 1990s, Russia was at least as controlled by the USA as Europe and the Ukraine are today. And the results were truly catastrophic: Russia was plundered for her natural wealth, billions of dollars were stolen and hidden in western offshore accounts, the Russian industry was destroyed, an unprecedented wave of violence, corruption, and poverty drowned the entire country in misery and the Russian Federation almost broke up into many small statelets. It was, by any measure, an absolute nightmare, a horror comparable to a major war. Russia was about to explode and something had to be done.

Two remaining centers of power, the oligarchs and the ex-KGB, were forced to seek a solution to this crisis and they came up with the idea of sharing power: the former would be represented by

Dmitrii Medvedev and the latter by Vladimir Putin. Both sides believed that they would keep the other side in check and that this combination of big money and big muscle would yield a sufficient degree of stability.

I call the group behind Medvedev the "Atlantic Integrationists" and the people behind Putin the "Eurasian Sovereignists". The former wants Russia to be accepted by the West as an equal partner and fully integrate Russia into the Anglo-Zionist Empire, while the latter want to fully "sovereignize" Russia and then create a multi-polar international system with the help of China and the other BRICS countries.

What the Atlantic Integrationists did not expect is that Putin would slowly but surely begin to squeeze them out of power: first he cracked down on the most notorious oligarchs such as Berezovskii and Khodorkovskii, then he began cracking down on the local oligarchs, gubernatorial mafias, ethnic mobsters, corrupt industry officials, etc. Putin restored the "vertical [axis]of power" and crushed the Wahabi insurgents in Chechnia. Putin even carefully set up the circumstances needed to get rid of some of the worst ministers such as Serdiukov

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anatoliy\\_Serdyukov](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anatoliy_Serdyukov))

and Kudrin ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexei\\_Kudrin](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexei_Kudrin)).

But what Putin has so far failed to do is to

- Reform the Russian political system
- Replace the 5th columnists in and around the Kremlin
- Reform the Russian economy

The current Russian Constitution and system of government is a pure product of the US 'advisors' which, after the bloody crackdown on the opposition in 1993, allowed Boris Yeltsin to run the country until 1999. It is paradoxical that the West now speaks of a despotic presidency referring to Putin when all he did is inherit a Western-designed political system. The problem for Putin today

is that it makes no sense to replace some of the worst people in power as long as the system remains unchanged. But the main obstacle to a reform of the political system is the resistance of the pro-Western 5th columnists in and around the Kremlin. They are also the ones who are still forcing a set of "Washington consensus" ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Washington\\_Consensus](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Washington_Consensus)) kind of policies upon Russia even though it is obvious that the consequences for Russia are extremely bad, even disastrous. There is no doubt that Putin understands that, but he has been unable, at least so far, to break out of this dynamic.

So who are these 5th columnists?

I have selected nine of the names most often mentioned by Russian analysts. These are (in no particular order):

Former First Deputy Prime Minister Anatolii Chubais,  
([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anatoly\\_Chubais](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anatoly_Chubais))

First Deputy Governor of the Russian Central Bank Ksenia Iudaeva, (<http://www.weforum.org/people/ksenia-yudaeva>)

Deputy Prime Minister Arkadii Dvorkovich,  
([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arkady\\_Dvorkovich](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arkady_Dvorkovich))

First Deputy Prime Minister Igor Shuvalov,  
([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Igor\\_Shuvalov](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Igor_Shuvalov))

Governor of the Russian Central Bank Elvira Nabiullina,  
([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elvira\\_Nabiullina](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elvira_Nabiullina))

former Minister of Finance Alexei Kudrin,  
([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexei\\_Kudrin](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexei_Kudrin))

Minister of Economic Development, Alexei Ulyukaev,  
([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexey\\_Ulyukaev](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexey_Ulyukaev))

Minister of Finance Anton Siluanov  
([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anton\\_Siluanov](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anton_Siluanov)) and  
Prime Minister Dmitri Medvedev.



The Russian 5th column: Chubais, Iudaeva, Dvorkovich, Shuvalov, Nabiullina, Kudrin, Uliukaev, Siluanov, Medvedev

This is, of course, only a partial list – the real list is longer and runs deeper in the Russian power structure. The people on this list range from dangerous ideologues like Kudrin or Chubais, to mediocre and unimaginative people, like Siluanov or Nabiullina. And none of them would, by him or herself, represent much of a threat to Putin. But as a group and in the current political system they are a formidable foe which has kept Putin in check. I do believe, however, that a purge is being prepared.

One of the possible signs of a purge to come is the fact that the Russian media, both the blogosphere and the big corporate media, are now very critical of the economic policies of the government of Prime Minister Medvedev. Most Russian economists agree that the real reason for the current economic crisis in Russia is not the falling price of oil or, even less so, the Western sanctions, but the misguided decisions of the Russian Central Bank (such as floating the Ruble or keeping the interest rates high) and the lack of governmental action to support a real reform and development of the Russian economy. What is especially interesting is that vocal opponents of the current 5th column now get plenty of air time in the Russian media, including state owned VGTRK.

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/All-](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/All-Russia_State_Television_and_Radio_Broadcasting_Company)

[Russia\\_State\\_Television\\_and\\_Radio\\_Broadcasting\\_Company](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/All-Russia_State_Television_and_Radio_Broadcasting_Company))

Leading opponents of the current economic policies, such as

Sergei Glazev

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sergey\\_Glazyev](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sergey_Glazyev)),

Mikhail Deliagin

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mikhail\\_Delyagin](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mikhail_Delyagin)) or

Mikhail Khazin

(<http://vineyardsaker.blogspot.com/2014/10/exclusive-mikhail-khazin-q-with-saker.html>) are now interviewed at length and given all the time needed to absolutely blast the economic policies of the Medvedev government. And yet, Putin is still taking no visible action. In fact, in his latest yearly address, he even praised the work of the Russian Central Bank. So what is going on here?

First, and to those exposed to the western propaganda, this might be difficult to imagine, but Putin is constrained simply by the rule of law. He cannot just send some special forces and have all these folks arrested on some kind of charge of corruption, malfeasance or sabotage. Many in Russia very much regret that, but this is a fact of life.

In theory, Putin could simply fire the entire (or part) of the government and appoint a different Governor to the Central Bank. But the problem with that is that it would trigger an extremely violent reaction from the West. Mikhail Deliagin recently declared that if Putin did this, the West's reaction would be even more violent than after the Crimean reunification with Russia. Is he right? Maybe. But I personally believe that Putin is not only concerned about the reaction of the West, but also from the Russian elites, particularly those well off, who generally already intensely dislike Putin and who would see such a purge as an attack on their personal and vital interests. The combination of US subversion and local big money definitely has the ability to create some kind of crisis in Russia. This is, I think, by far the biggest threat Putin is facing. But here also can be observed a paradoxical dynamic:

On one hand, Russia and the West have been in an open confrontation ever since Russia prevented the USA from attacking Syria. The Ukrainian crisis only made things worse. Add to this the dropped prices of oil and the western sanctions and you could say

that Putin now, more than ever, needs to avoid anything which could make the crisis even worse.

But on the other hand, this argument can be flipped around by saying that considering how bad the tensions already are and considering that the West has already done all it can to harm Russia, is this not the perfect time to finally clean house and get rid of the 5th column? Really – how much worse can things really get?

Only Putin knows the answer to this simply because only he has all the facts. All we can do is observe that the popular discontent with the "economic block" of the government and with the Central Bank is most definitely growing and growing fast and that the Kremlin is doing nothing to inhibit or suppress such feelings. We can also notice that while most Russians are angry, disgusted and frustrated with the economic policies of the Medvedev government, Putin's personal popularity is still sky high in spite of the fact that the Russian economy most definitely took a hit, even if it was much smaller than what the AngloZionist Empire had hoped for.

My strictly personal explanation for what is happening is this: Putin is deliberately letting things get worse because he knows that the popular anger will not be directed at him, but only at his enemies. Think of it, is that not exactly what the Russian security services did in the 1990s? Did they not allow the crisis in Russia to reach its paroxysm before pushing Putin into power and then ruthlessly cracking down on the oligarchs? Did Putin not wait until the Wahabis in Chechnia actually attacked Dagestan before unleashing the Russian military? Did the Russians not let Saakashvili attack South Ossetia before basically destroying his entire military? Did Putin not wait until a full-scale Ukronazi attack on the Donbass before opening up the "voentorg" (military supplies) and the "northern wind" (dispatch of volunteers) spigots? Putin's critiques would say that no, not at all, Putin got surprised,

he was sleeping on the job, and he had to react, but his reaction was too little too late and that when he had to take action it was only to fix a situation which had turned into a disaster. My answer to these critiques is simple: so what happened at the end? Did Putin not get exactly what he wanted each time?

I believe that Putin is acutely aware that his real power basis is not primarily the Russian military or the security services, but the Russian people. This, in turn, means that for him to take any action, especially any dangerous action, he must secure an almost unconditional level of support from the Russian people. That, in turn, means that he can only take such risky action if and when the crisis is evident for all to see and that the Russian people are willing to have him take a risk and, if needed, pay the consequences. This is exactly what we saw in the case of the reunification of Crimea or the current Russian military intervention in Syria: the Russian people are concerned, they are suffering the consequences of the decision of Putin to take action, but they accept it because they believe that there is no other option.

So there you have it. Either Putin is sleeping on the job, is caught off-guard by each crisis and reacts too late, or Putin deliberately lets a situation worsen until a full-scale crisis is evident at which point he acts with the full knowledge that the Russian people fully support him and will blame him neither for the crisis, nor for the price of decidedly dealing with it.

Pick the version which seems more plausible to you.

What is certain is that so far Putin has failed to deal with the 5th column near and inside the Kremlin and that the situation is rapidly worsening. The recent move by Kudrin to try to get back into the government

(<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/videos/2015-12-29/kudrin-said-in-talks-with-putin-for-senior-post>) was a rather transparent use of the pro-5th column media in Russia (and abroad) and it

predictably failed. But this shows an increasing self-confidence, or even arrogance, of the Atlantic Integrationists. Something is bound to happen, probably in the near future.



# Why I Use the Term ‘AngloZionist’, and Why It’s Important

February 03, 2016

One of the issues over which I am most vehemently criticized, even by well-meaning friends, is my use of the term “AngloZionist”.

After carefully parsing all the arguments of my critics, I wrote a special explanatory note (<http://thesaker.is/anglozionist-short-primer-for-the-newcomers/>) on my blog two years ago, in order to make sure that my argument leaves no room for misunderstanding.

I reproduce it below as a (rather long) introduction to the article which follows, which is essentially a further development of the ideas in my 2014 post.

*“To learn who rules over you, simply find out who you are not allowed to criticize“*

– Voltaire

(The following quoted section is from the Saker’s blog (with slight modifications), from September 2014)

*“Why do I speak of “AngloZionists”? I got that question many times in the past, so I am making a separate post about it to (hopefully) explain this once and for all.*

*1) Anglo:*

*The USA is an Empire. With roughly 1000 overseas bases (depends on how you count), an undeniably*

*messianic ideology, a bigger defense-offense budget than the rest of the planet combined, 16+ spy agencies, the dollar as the world's currency, there is no doubt that the US is a planetary Empire.*

*Where did the US Empire come from? Again, that's a no-brainer – from the British Empire. Furthermore, the US Empire is really based on a select group of nations: the Echelon countries,*

*(<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ECHELON>);*

*Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the UK and, of course, the US. What do these countries have in common? They are the leftovers of the British Empire and they are all English speaking. Notice that France, Germany or Japan are not part of this elite even though they are arguably as important or more so to the USA than, say, New Zealand and far more powerful.*

*So the “Anglo” part is undeniable. And yet, even though “Anglo” is an ethnic/linguistic/cultural category while “Zionist” is a political/ideological one, very rarely do I get an objection about speaking of “Anglos” or the “Anglosphere”.*

*2) Zionist:*

*Let's take the (hyper politically correct) Wikipedia definition (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zionism>) of what the word “Zionism” means: it is “a nationalist movement of Jews and Jewish culture that supports the creation of a Jewish homeland in the territory defined as the Land of Israel“. Apparently, no link to the US, the Ukraine or Timbuktu, right? But think again. Why would Jews – whether defined as a religion or an ethnicity – need a homeland anyway? Why can't they*

*just live wherever they are born, just like Buddhist (a religion) or the African Bushmen (ethnicity) who live in many different countries?*

*The canonical answer is that Jews have been persecuted everywhere and that therefore they need their own homeland to serve as a safe haven in case of persecutions. Without going into the issue of why Jews were persecuted everywhere and, apparently, in all times, this rationale clearly implies if not the inevitability of more persecutions or, at the very least, a high risk thereof. Let's accept that for demonstration's sake and see what this, in turn, implies.*

*First, that implies that Jews are inherently threatened by non-Jews who are all at least potential anti-Semites. The threat is so severe that a separate Gentile-free homeland must be created as the only, best and last way to protect Jews worldwide. This, in turn, implies that the continued existence of this homeland should become a vital and irreplaceable priority of all Jews worldwide lest a persecution suddenly breaks out and they have nowhere to go. Furthermore, until all Jews finally “move up” to Israel, they had better be very, very careful as all the goyim around them could literally come down with a sudden case of genocidal anti-Semitism at any moment.*

*(<http://www.counterpunch.org/2002/06/04/what-is-antisemitism/>)*

*Hence all the anti-anti-Semitic organizations a la ADL or UEJF, the Betar clubs, the networks of sayanim, etc.*

*In other words, far from being a local “dealing with Israel only” phenomenon, Zionism is a worldwide*



*movement whose aim is to protect Jews from the apparently incurable anti-Semitism of the rest of the planet.*

*As Israel Shahak (<http://www.amazon.com/Jewish-History-Religion-Thousand-Political/dp/0745328407/>) correctly identified it, Zionism postulates that Jews should “think locally and act globally” and when given a choice of policies they should always ask THE crucial question: “But is it good for Jews?” (<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article39558.htm>)*

*So, far from being only focused on Israel, Zionism is really a global, planetary ideology which unequivocally splits up all of mankind into two groups (Jews and Gentiles). It assumes the latter are all potential genocidal maniacs (which is racist) and believes that saving Jewish lives is qualitatively different and more important than saving Gentile lives (which is racist again).*

*Anyone doubting the ferocity of this determination should either ask a Palestinian or study the holiday of Purim, or both. Even better, read Gilad Atzmon (<http://www.amazon.com/The-Wandering-Who-Gilad-Atzmon/dp/1846948754/>) and look up his definition of what is brilliantly called “pre-traumatic stress disorder”*

### *3) AngloZionist:*

*The British Empire and the early USA used to be pretty much wall-to-wall Anglo. Sure, Jews had a strong influence (in banking for example), but Zionism was a non-issue, not only among non-Jews but also among US Jews. Besides, religious Jews were often very hostile to the*

*notion of a secular Israel while secular Jews did not really care about this quasi-Biblical notion.*

*WWII gave a massive boost to the Zionist movement while, as Norman Finkelstein explained it, (<http://www.amazon.com/The-Holocaust-Industry-Reflections-Exploitation/dp/185984488X/>), the topic of the “Holocaust” became central to Jewish discourse and identity only many years later. I won’t go into the history of the rise to power of Jews in the USA, but from roughly Ford to GW Bush’s Neocons it has been steady. And even though Obama initially pushed the Neocons out, they came right back in through the backdoor. Right now, the only question is whether US Jews have more power than US Anglos or the other way around.*

*Before going any further, let me also immediately say that I am not talking about Jews or Anglos as a group, but I am referring to the top 1% within each of these groups. Furthermore, I don’t believe that the top 1% of Jews cares any more about Israel or the 99% of Jews than the top 1% of Anglos care about the USA or the Anglo people.*

*So, here is my thesis:*

*The US Empire is run by a 1% (or less) elite which can be called the “deep state” which is composed of two main groups: Anglos and Jews. These two groups are in many ways hostile to each other (just like the SS and SA or Trotskyists and Stalinists), but they share*

- 1) a racist outlook on the rest of mankind*
- 2) a messianic ideology*
- 3) a phenomenal propensity for violence*

4) *an obsession with money and greed and its power to corrupt.*

*So they work together almost all the time.*

*Now this might seem basic, but so many people miss it, that I will have to explicitly state it:*

*To say that most US elites are Anglos or Jews does not mean that most Anglos or Jews are part of the US elites. That is a straw-man argument which deliberately ignores the non-commutative property of my thesis to turn it into a racist statement which accuses most/all Anglos or Jews of some evil doing. So to be very clear:*

*When I speak of the AngloZionist Empire I am referring to the predominant ideology of the 1%ers, the elites which form the Empire's "deep state".*

*By the way, there are non-Jewish Zionists (Biden, in his own words) and there are plenty of anti-Zionist Jews. Likewise, there are non-Anglo imperialists and there are plenty of anti-imperialist Anglos. To speak of "Nazi Germany" or "Soviet Russia" does in no way imply that all Germans were Nazis or all Russians Communists. All this means is that the predominant ideology of these nations at that specific moment in time was National-Socialism and Marxism, that's all.*

*My personal opinion now:*

*First, I don't believe that Jews are a race or an ethnicity. I have always doubted it, but reading Shlomo Sand (<http://www.amazon.com/Invention-Jewish-People-Shlomo-Sand/dp/1844676234/>) really convinced me. Jews are not defined by religion either (most/many are secular). Truly, Jews are a tribe (which Oxford Dictionaries defines*

([http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american\\_english/tribe](http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/us/definition/american_english/tribe))

*as a social division in a traditional society consisting of families or communities linked by social, economic, religious, or blood ties, with a common culture and dialect, typically having a recognized leader). A group one can choose to join, (Elizabeth Taylor)*

(<http://religion.blogs.cnn.com/2011/03/24/making-sense-of-elizabeth-taylors-jewish-conversion/>) or leave, (Gilad Atzmon).

*In other words, I see “Jewishness” as a culture, or ideology, or education or any other number of things, but not something rooted in biology. I fully agree with Atzmon when he says that Jews can be racist, but that does not make them a race.*

*Second, I don't even believe that the concept of “race” has been properly defined and, hence, that it has any objective meaning. I, therefore, don't differentiate between human beings on the basis of an undefined criterion.*

*Third, since being Jew (or not) is a choice: to belong, adhere and endorse a tribe (secular Jews) or a religion (Judaics). Any choice implies a judgment call and it, therefore, is a legitimate target for scrutiny and criticism.*

*Fourth, I believe that Zionism, even when secular, instrumentalizes the values, ideas, myths and ethos of rabbinical Judaism (aka “Talmudism” or “Phariseism”) and both are racist in their core value and assumptions.*

*Fifth, both Zionism and Nazism are twin brothers born from the same ugly womb: 19th-century European nationalism (Brecht was right, "The belly is still fertile from which the foul beast sprang"). Nazis and Zionists can hate each other to their hearts' content, but they are still twins.*

*Sixth, I reject any and all forms of racism as a denial of our common humanity, a denial of the freedom of choice of each human being and – being an Orthodox Christian – as a heresy (a form of iconoclasm, really). To me people who chose to identify themselves with, and as, Jews are not inherently different from any other human and they deserve no more and no fewer rights and protections than any other human being.*

*I will note here that while the vast majority of my readers are Anglos, they almost never complain about the "Anglo" part of my "AngloZionist" term. The vast majority of objections focus on the "Zionist" part. You might want to think long and hard about why this is so and what it tells us about the kind of power Zionists have over the prevailing ideology. Could it be linked to the reason why the (openly racist and truly genocidal) Israeli Prime Minister gets more standing ovations in Congress (29) than the US President (25)?*

*([http://www.salon.com/2011/05/24/netanyahu\\_standing\\_ovations/](http://www.salon.com/2011/05/24/netanyahu_standing_ovations/))*

*Probably, but this is hardly the full story."*

**(This is the end of the 2014 blog entry. The current article begins below)**

It is undeniable that Jews did suffer persecutions in the past and that the Nazis horribly persecuted Jews during WWII. This is important because nowadays we are all conditioned to associate and even identify any criticism of Jews or Zionists with the kind of anti-Jewish and anti-Zionist rhetoric which the Nazis used to justify their atrocities. This is quite understandable, but it is also completely illogical because what this reaction is based on is the implicit assumption that any criticism of Jews or Zionists must be Nazi in its argumentation, motives, goals or methods. This is beyond ridiculous.

Saint John Chrysostom (349 – 407), the “Golden Mouth” of early Christianity, recognized as one of the greatest saints in history by both Orthodox Christians and Roman Catholics, authored a series of homilies, *Kata Ioudaiōn*, ([http://www.preteristarchive.com/ChurchHistory/0386\\_chrysostom\\_adversus-judeaus.html](http://www.preteristarchive.com/ChurchHistory/0386_chrysostom_adversus-judeaus.html)) which are extremely critical of Jews, yet no sane person would accuse him of being a Nazi. Chrysostom was hardly alone. Other great saints critical of Jews include Saint Cyprian of Carthage, Saint Gregory of Nyssa, Saint Ephrem the Syrian, Saint Ambrose of Milan, Saint Justin Martyr and many others.

But if these saints were not Nazis, maybe they still were racist, no? That, of course, depends on your definition of ‘racism’. Here is my own:

First, *racism is, in my opinion, not so much the belief that various human groups are different from each other, say like dog breeds can be different, but the belief that the differences between human groups are larger than similarities within the group.*

Second, *racism is also a belief that the biological characteristics of your group somehow predetermine your actions/choices/values in life.*

Third, *racism often, but not always, assumes a hierarchy amongst human groups (Germanic Aryans over Slavs or Jews, Jews over Gentiles, etc.)*

I reject all three of these assumptions because I believe that God created all humans with the same purpose and that we are all “brothers in Adam”, that we all equally share the image (eternal and inherent potential for perfection) of God (as opposed to our likeness to Him, which is our temporary and changing individual condition).

By that definition, the Church Fathers were most definitely not racists as their critique was solely aimed at the religion of the Jews, not at their ethnicity (which is hardly surprising since Christ and His Apostles and most early Christians were all “ethnic” Jews). This begs the question of whether criticizing a religion is legitimate or not.

I submit that anything resulting from an individual choice is fair game for criticism. Even if somebody is “born into” a religious community, all adults come to the point in life where they make a conscious decision to endorse or reject the religion they were “born into”. Being a Christian, a Muslim or a Jew (in the sense of “Judaic”) is always a personal decision. The same applies to political views. One chooses to become a Marxist or a Monarchist or a Zionist. And since our individual decisions do, indeed, directly impact our other choices in life; it is not racist or objectionable to criticize Christianity, Islam, Judaism, Marxism, Monarchism or Zionism. Criticizing any one of them, or even all of them, in no way denies our common humanity which is something which racism always does.

Having said all that, none of the above addresses a most important, but rarely openly discussed, issue: what if, regardless of all the arguments above, using expressions such as “Anglo-Zionism” offends some people (Jews or not). What if the use of

this term alienates them so much that it would make them unwilling to listen to any argument or point of view using this expression?

This is a very different issue, not an ethical, moral or philosophical one – but a practical one: is it worth losing readers, supporters and even donors for the sake of using an expression which requires several pages of explanations in its defense? This issue is one every blogger, every website, every alternative news outlet has had to struggle with. I know that I got more angry emails over this than over any other form of crimethink I so often engage in.

I will readily admit that there is a cost involved in using the term “AngloZionist Empire”. But that cost needs to be compared to the cost of \*not\* using that term.

Is there anybody out there who seriously doubts the huge role the so-called “Israeli Lobby” or the “Neocons” or, to use the expression of Professor James Petras, the “Zionist Power Configuration” plays in modern politics?

(<http://www.countercurrents.org/petras180708.htm>)

Twenty years ago – maybe; but not today. We all are perfectly aware of the “elephant in the room”, courtesy not only of courageous folks like Gilad Atzmon, Israel Shahak or Norman Finkelstein but even such mainstream Anglo personalities as John J. Mearsheimer, Stephen M. Walt or even Jimmy Carter.

It is plain silly to pretend that we don’t know when **we all know that we all know**.

Pretending that we don’t see this elephant in the room makes us look either subservient to that elephant, or simply like a coward who dares not speak truth to power. In other words, if you want to shoot your credibility, pretend really hard that you are totally unaware of the elephant in the room: some of your sponsors might love you, but everybody else will despise you.



What about the very real risk of being perceived as some kind of Nazi?

Yes, the risk is there, but only if you allow yourself to flirt with racist or even para-racist notions. But if you are categorical in your rejection of any form of racism (including any form of anti-Jewish racism), then the accusation will simply not stick. Oh sure, the Zionists out there will try hard to make you look like a Nazi, but they will fail simply because they will have nothing to base that accusation on other than some vague “overtones” or “lack of sensitivity”. In my experience, people are not that stupid and they rapidly see through that worn-out accusation of “anti-Semitism” a meaningless concept to begin with, as Michael Neumann so brilliantly demonstrates in his essay “What is Anti-Semitism?” (<http://www.counterpunch.org/2002/06/04/what-is-antisemitism/>).

The truth is that the Zionists are only as powerful as we allow them to be. If we allow them to scare us into silence, then indeed their power is immense, but if we simply demand that they stop treating some humans as “more equal than others” then their own racism suddenly becomes obvious for all to see and their power vanishes.

It is really that simple: since nobody can accuse a real anti-racist of racism, then truly being an anti-racist gives you immunity against the accusation of anti-Semitism.

So what we need, at this point, is to consider the terms used.

“Israeli Lobby” suffers from several major issues. First, it implies that the folks in this lobby really care about Israel and the people of Israel. While some probably do, we also have overwhelming evidence (such as the testimony of Sibel Edmonds) that many/most folks in the “Israeli Lobby” use the topic of Israel for their own, very different goals (usually power, often money).

Have the people of Israel really benefited from the Neocon-triggered wars? I doubt it.

Furthermore, when hearing the words "Israeli Lobby" most people will think of a lobby in the US Congress, something like the NRA or the AARP. The problem we are dealing with today is clearly international. Bernard-Henri Levi, George Soros or Mikhail Khodorkovsky have no connection to AIPAC or the US Congress. "Zionist Power Configuration" is better, but "configuration" is vague. What we are dealing with is clearly an empire. Besides, this is clearly not only a Zionist Empire; the Anglo component is at least as influential, so why only mention one and not both?

Still, I don't think that we should get too caught up in semantics here. From my point of view, there are two truly essential issues which need to be addressed:

- 1) We need to start talking freely about the "elephant in the room" and stop fearing reprisals from those who want us to pretend we don't see it.

- 2) We need to stop using politically correct euphemisms in the vain hope that those who want us to shut up will accept them. They won't.

Currently, much of the discourse on Jewish or Zionist topics is severely restricted. Doubting the obligatory "6 million" murdered Jews during WWII can land in you jail in several European countries. Ditto if you express any doubts about the actual mode of executions (gas chambers vs firing squads and disease) of these Jews. "Revisionism", as asking such questions is now known, is seen either as a crime or, at least, a moral abomination, even though "revisionism" is what all real historians do: historiography is revisionist by its very nature. But even daring to mention such truisms immediately makes you a potential Nazi in the eyes of many/most people.

Since when is expressing a doubt an endorsement of an ideology? This is crazy, no?

I personally came to the conclusion that the West became an easy victim of such “conceptual hijackings” because of a sense of guilt about having let the Nazis murder so many European Jews without taking any meaningful action. It is a fact that it was the Soviet Union which carried 80% or more of the burden of destroying Hitler’s war machine: most Europeans resisted shamefully little. As for the Anglos, they waited until the Soviet victory before even entering the war in Europe.

Okay, fine – let those who feel guilty feel guilty (even if I personally don’t believe in collective guilt). But we cannot allow them to try to silence those of us who strongly feel that we are guilty of absolutely nothing!

Do we really have to kowtow to all Jews, including the top 1% of Jews who, like all 1%ers, do not care about the rest of the 99%? How long are we going to continue to allow the top 1% of Jews to enjoy a bizarre form of political immunity because they hide behind the memory of Jews murdered during WWII or the political sensitivities of the 99% of Jews with whom they have no real connection anyway?

I strongly believe that all 1%ers are exactly the same: they care about themselves and nobody else. Their power, what I call the AngloZionist Empire, is based on two things: deception and violence. Their worldview is based on one of two forms of messianism: Anglo imperialism and Zionism (which is just a secularized version of Judaic racial exceptionalism). This has nothing to do with Nazism, WWII or anti-Semitism and everything with ruthless power politics. Unless we are willing to call a spade a spade we will never be able to meaningfully oppose this Empire or the 1%ers who run it.

In truth, we owe them nothing except our categorical rejection and opposition. It is, I believe, our moral duty to shed a powerful light on their true nature and debunk the lies they try so hard to hide behind.

If their way is by deception, then ours ought to be by truth, because, as Christ said, the truth shall make us free.

Euphemisms only serve to further enslave us.



# Could Russia Still Become an Ally of the West?

March 11, 2016

Listening to Donald Trump speaking about his desire to turn Russia into an ally, I caught myself wondering if that was even still a possibility. After all, "the West" – and by that, I mean every single Western politician – has been lying to Russia ever since the fall of the Soviet Union. Not only has the West lied to Russia (for example on the promise to expand NATO), but the West has also back-stabbed Russia and fully sided with the most vicious and evil enemies of Russia including the Wahabis in Chechnia or the Nazis in the Ukraine. The West assembled a huge air force to mercilessly and illegally bomb the Serbs, a historical ally of Russia and fellow Orthodox people, in Croatia, then in Bosnia, then in Kosovo and then even in Montenegro and Serbia proper. The West also illegally and brutally overthrew Gaddafi in direct violation of United Nations Security Council resolutions and now, having laid waste to Libya (and Iraq!), the West is trying to repeat this performance with Syria. In the case of the Ukraine, the West stood by while the Ukronazis used every single weapon in their arsenal, including chemical weapons, ballistic missiles, heavy artillery, multiple rocket launchers, cluster munitions and bombers against the cities of the Donbass and then imposed sanctions, no, not on Kiev, but on Russia. And even when the Ukronazis burned over 100 civilians in Odessa, the West fully backed them again. Before the Olympic Games in Sochi, the West then unleashed its "homo lobby" and its "pussy rioters" to try to paint Russia as some kind of quasi-Saudi society while never even uttering a single word of criticism against what was really taking place in the real Saudi Arabia, a close ally of the "indispensable nation". And when Turkey ambushed a Russian

bomber which had given its full flight plan to the US and then shot it down, the West had no more to say about it then when the local al-Qaeda franchise in Egypt bombed a Russian airliner. In its latest manifestation of rabid Russophobia, the West, led by the US Secretary of State Kerry, is demanding the release by Russia of a rabid Nazi death squad member accused of murdering 2 Russian journalists, Nadezhda Savchenko. Most amazingly, Kerry is claiming that Russia is violating her obligations under the Minsk-2 Agreement by judging Savchenko even though Russia is not a party to this agreement which has nothing to say about Savchenko's case anyway. We can be pretty sure that if the Devil himself decided to appear somewhere in the USA or Europe and declared that he wanted to fight Russia, the West would give Satan full support, money, training, recognition, etc.

Considering all of this, one could reasonably assume that anti-western feelings have reached a boiling point in Russia and that Russia will never again be an ally with the West.

But that would be very wrong.

What is true is that most Russians look at the West with a sense of disgust, but "most Russians" are not sitting in the Kremlin. Russian decision-makers are first and foremost pragmatists; they understand that ruffled feathers and hurt feelings are not the kind of things which should define policies. Furthermore, whatever their feelings about Western politicians, Russian leaders fully understand that Russia is still the weaker party in any confrontation with the West and that it would be highly desirable to restore some kind of working relationship with the West. Please notice that I said "highly desirable", but not "necessary" or "vital". Russia is ready to struggle through a long period of "warm warfare" against the West if needed, but that hardly means that this is good for Russia. In fact, the core principle of Russian foreign policy has been expressed by both Lavrov and Putin on many occasions in the

past. It goes something like this: “*we need to turn our enemies into neutrals, neutrals into partners, partners into friends and our friends into allies*”. This might seem rather self-evident until you contrast this with the AngloZionist position which can be summarized as such: “*we need to turn everybody into our slaves*”.

Now ask yourself this: how exactly could the Russians turn enemies into neutrals, etc.? I submit that the only way to achieve such a result is to work with somebody, with some political forces, inside the West and to help them move the West in the right direction. The Russians are most unlikely to achieve their goal if they just lump every single western politician into an “our enemy” category. What the Russians need to do is to identify those individuals or political forces in the West which are the most likely to be interested in some (or even many) forms of cooperation with Russia. Hence the recent contacts with the European far-right parties (such as the National Front in France).

Okay, but why would any western politician or political force be interested in cooperating with Russia? Would that not be a huge liability in the generally Russophobic West? Would the opponents of such cooperation not denounce it as a sign of “weakness” and a “sell-out”? Last but not least, what does Russia have to offer to such a political figure or political force?

Let's take those step by step.

First, I would not exaggerate the Russophobia of the West. If we are speaking about the elites, then yes, they are generally rabidly Russophobic. But the common people? Much less so, I think. And those who are Russophobic are so because they are conditioned by the media to view Russia with fear, but that is a superficial feeling which can be reversed by common sense and self-interest. Will the opponents of any such cooperation denounce it? Yes, of course, that is to be expected, but whether this attack will be successful or

not will depend on the outcome of such cooperation. Thus the key question is what does Russia have to offer?

A lot, in fact.

First and foremost, if some non-anti-Russian politician or political force comes to power in any western country, Russia can make darn sure that he/she gets, shall we say, "most favorite" status, meaning that in any negotiations, Russia will have a stake in contributing to a political success for that individual or party. The obvious example: Trump becomes the next POTUS and offers to Russia a real partnership to deal with Daesh, not only in Syria but also in Iraq. I would argue that Russia would have a huge stake into "delivering" this objective to Trump as the best way to silence the anti-Russian forces inside the USA. Another example: an EU national leader breaks ranks with the Eurocracy and decides to unilaterally lift the sanctions against Russia. At this point, Russia would have a huge interest in rewarding such a move by offering many lucrative contracts to this country on a preferential basis.

Paradoxically, one of the countries which would stand to benefit most from such a scenario would be Turkey. Not Erdogan's Turkey, of course. The Kremlin has effectively "Shaakashvili-ized" Erdogan and his future now looks bleak, to say the least. But imagine if the Turkish military decided to overthrow Erdogan and immediately call Moscow with a simple message: "help us and we will help you!" Just imagine what Russia could do to assist a post-Erdogan Turkey.

First and foremost, Russia could play the role of an honest broker between Ankara and the Kurds, in a way similar to what the USA tried to do in Northern Ireland. Russia could "bring in" Syria, Iraq, and Iran and make some kind of push for a "comprehensive deal" with the various Kurdish parties.

Russia could literally kick-start the Turkish economy, not only by allowing the Turks to re-enter the lucrative Russian market



(construction, agriculture, tourism, etc.) but also by offering the Turks a range of cooperative deals not only in Russia but also outside Russia (Latin America, Asia). At the very least Russia could reopen the "gates of tourism" and single-handedly kick-start resort business. Potentially, an Ankara-Moscow axis of cooperation could be most useful to both countries, even if the historical record mainly shows already 12 wars between the two countries.

Right now Erdogan is in a terrible situation and nobody can help him, least of all the Saudis or the US. As long as he remains in power, Russia will completely ignore him. But the Russians are not stupid, they know that Turkey is an enemy whereas what they need is for Turkey to be at the very least a reliable partner. This is why Putin will work with anybody except Erdogan to fix this bloody mess.

Right now the West is "confronting" Russia everywhere, from the Arctic waters to the Pacific – but this begs the question of who really needs that?! Is that not a huge waste of resources and efforts when working with Russia could be so much more beneficial? This state of affairs is even more grotesque when we consider that the one and only reason for the current "tepid war" with Russia is AngloZionist imperial hubris whose prime directive remains "*we need to turn everybody into our slaves*". This is exactly what Putin meant when he replied to a question suggesting that the USA wanted to humiliate Russia and said "*You said that the USA wants to humiliate us. This is not the case. They do not want to humiliate us, they want to subjugate us; they want to solve their problems at our expense, to submit us to their influence. Never has anyone done this in history in relation to Russia and no one ever will*". (<https://www.rt.com/news/206623-putin-us-never-subdue-russia/>) It is this maniacal insistence on subjugating every nation on the planet coupled with a total inability to cooperate on a mutually respectful basis which has brought us to the edge of a

thermonuclear war between Russia and the USA. This is a purely ideological problem which does not have any objective basis in reality.

Listening to Trump, I get the feeling that there are clearly some folks in the USA who do not suffer from that kind of megalomania and who are much more interested in getting things done rather than sacrificing it all in the name of some kind of (unsustainable) “indispensable nation” status. The Europeans are willing to be governed by the AngloZionist “deep state”, but only as long as this kind of collaborationism does not result in massive waves of refugees, crime, and poverty. Already major politicians, such as Sarkozy and Berlusconi, are breaking ranks and more and more people are wondering whether it was a good idea to engage Russia in a “tepid war”, especially in support of a Nazi coup in Kiev.

I think that it is highly likely that this process of “realization” will only accelerate. JFK once said, paraphrasing Tacitus that “*victory has 100 fathers and defeat is an orphan*”. The utter failure to successfully confront Russia in the Ukraine, Syria or elsewhere will soon begin to generate many “denials of paternity” and a rush to embrace a far more promising policy of collaboration with Russia.

[Sidebar: when that happens I will look with a definite sense of glee and even *Schadenfreude* at the Baltic States and Central European countries who fancied themselves as an important and attractive “ally” for the West against Russia only to realize that neither the West nor Russia give a damn about them].

Whatever the outcome of the US Presidential election, I think that Trump’s statement that he wanted to work with Putin and Russia (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tjo4u88no7U>)

already gives him a competitive advantage over his opponents. He put it very simply: “what do we need problems for?!” He is absolutely correct, of course.

Historically, Russia’s relation with the West has been a “difficult one”. You probably know that the Soviet Union was under various western sanctions for most of its existence. But did you know that was also the case for pre-1917 Czarist Russia which also spent decades under various sanctions for all sort of spurious pretexts? In fact, ever since 1242 and the so-called “Northern Crusade” of Pope Gregory IX, the West has been trying to subjugate Russia under some ideological pretext (Papism, Revolutionary Freemasonry, Nazism, Capitalism, etc.) (<http://thesaker.is/ukrainian-nationalism-its-roots-and-nature/>)

But there is no inevitability in this, no objective reason for this never-ending confrontation. As long as the leaders of the West could delude themselves about being the “bearers of civilization” entrusted by God to civilize and convert everybody on the planet to their brand of “Christianity” the conflict was probably inevitable. But right now the AngloZionists have really brought down what used to be called the “Western civilization”, like a parasite kills his host, while countries such as Russia or China are, for the first time in centuries, breaking out of their subservient status. This will be a long, and dangerous, process, but the writing is on the wall. Those in the West who will have the wisdom to see this writing and who will find the courage to renounce exceptionalism will be able to use it to their advantage. As for the Russians, they will steadfastly continue to refuse to submit to the Empire while waiting for new partners to appear. Even if this is a long wait.



# The Writing is on the Wall for the European Union

March 26, 2016

The latest bomb attacks in Brussels are the clear proof that the attacks in Paris were not a fluke, but the first in what is likely to be a long string of similar terror attacks. Such attacks are really nothing new, this is exactly what Russia had to endure in the 1990s, from the same people, and for the same reasons. But whereas Russia eventually succeeded in defeating both the Chechen Wahabi insurgency and the Chechen Wahabi terrorism, Europe appears to lack all the resources needed to prevail. What is even worse, EU leaders appear to be dead set in their current Russophobic policies thereby cutting themselves off from the much-needed help Russia could offer.

There are objective reasons why Brussels was chosen: it is the capital of the European Union, of course, but it is also a “soft” target, much easier to hit than, say, the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE)

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Supreme\\_Headquarters\\_Allied\\_Powers\\_Europe](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Supreme_Headquarters_Allied_Powers_Europe))

in the Belgian city of Mons or the NATO HQ

([http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics\\_49284.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_49284.htm))

in city of Haran, near Brussels. But that is not the “really real” reason why Brussels was hit. The sad truth is that Europe has been setting itself up for exactly this kind of attack.

First, when the same people (Wahabi crazies) used the same methods (terror attacks) against the biggest neighbor of Europe (Russia), the European elites gave their full support to the terrorists, not only politically (by presenting them as freedom fighters) but even directly (MI6 and the CIA were both directly and

heavily involved in the Chechen wars). At that time Russia was very much like the EU today – ruled by a completely corrupt elite; totally sold out to the AngloZionist Empire; Russian security services were almost completely dismantled; the Russian general public mostly clueless about what was going on; and the economy was in a shambles. Russia was an easy (soft) target then just as Europe, all of it, is an easy (soft) target today.

Second, Europe has lovingly cultivated an obscene friendship with three of the foremost sponsors of terrorism on the planet – Turkey, Saudi Arabia and Israel. Being ‘in bed’ with that kind of bedfellows just had to result in some ugly blowback. And now that Erdogan precisely predicted the terror attack in Brussels, (<http://www.presstv.com/Detail/2016/03/22/457098/Turkey-Erdogan-predicted--Brussels-attacks/>) the Europeans are still not asking the hard questions (instead they choose to believe the claim that Erdogan warned the Europeans).

Third, for decades now the EU has had an absolutely suicidal policy on immigration or, should I maybe say, no real policy at all, unless you consider “let them all in” a policy. Every single intelligence service in Europe has known *for decades* that immigrants are a major risk, both in terms of petty crime such as drug dealing and in terms of terrorism. Everybody knew that, but political correctness prevented anybody of saying this openly lest he/she be accused of racism. Let me just give you one example: everybody in the Swiss police and intelligence community has known for years that the Albanian terrorists from the UCK had their political headquarters and money in Switzerland, even some newspapers mentioned this fact. Likewise, everybody in Switzerland also knew that Albanian mobsters control the hard drugs market. And yet the Swiss authorities did absolutely nothing to stop this. The same kind of denial happened in France with immigrants from the Maghreb (GIA) and in Germany with the

Turks (Grey Wolves) and Kurds (PKK). Instead of taking the measures needed to protect the general public, the politicians chose to hush up the problem, vilify those who dared mention it while the security services tried to appease (and even use!) the terrorist groups.

Fourth, the European police and security forces are typically understaffed, underpaid, under-trained, overworked, severely constrained in their actions and generally disorganized and uncoordinated. They also have a dire need for translators and interpreters and they often lack the legal basis to investigate and monitor or infiltrate the immigrant communities. In most countries, they are also underequipped and even their basic gear is old and outdated. Again, the parallel with Russia of the 1990s is striking.

Fifth, instead of focusing on the clear and present danger of the penetration of terrorists under the guise of refugees, Europe has concentrated its resources on countering the (non-existing) "Russian threat" wasting money on command centers, communication nodes, pre-positioned supply dumps and, of course, various exercises and maneuvers aimed at "detering the Russian bear". Even worse, the Europeans have, until now, categorically and repeatedly refused to collaborate with Russia on any security issues, including terrorism.

Sixth, the ruling elites of the EU have systematically branded those who dared to warn about the dangers of terrorism through immigration as "racists" while, at the same time, introducing all sorts of totally useless but very offensive anti-Muslim measures such as banning schoolgirls from wearing a veil (of course, kids in Jewish kippas were left unmolested) or raising a panic over the amount of *halal* butchers in Paris (of course, kosher stores were left unmolested).

It is therefore not surprising that such a toxic mix of stupidity and arrogance had to eventually result in attacks like those in Paris or Brussels. But the worst part of this is that there are no indications whatsoever that the European ruling elites have learned anything or that they are reconsidering their suicidal policies. So far, we have seen Federica Mogherini sobbing (<https://youtu.be/RmzFKnUmFDQ>) and the Eiffel Tower in Paris lit in Belgian colors.

(<http://www.vox.com/2016/3/22/11285806/brussels-attacks-eiffel-tower>) But still no real policy decision or even a general plan exists on how to deal with the current terrorist threat.

But what the EU does have is a 5-point plan on how to deal with Russia, a plan unanimously adopted by all 28 member states. This plan, called ‘guiding principles’ ([http://eeas.europa.eu/statements-eeas/2016/160314\\_02\\_en.htm](http://eeas.europa.eu/statements-eeas/2016/160314_02_en.htm)) is so arrogant and delusional, that it deserves to be full quoted here:

*“The first of these guiding principles is the full implementation of the Minsk agreements as a key element for any substantial change in our relations. By the way, this is an important week, it is the week where two years ago the illegal annexation of Crimea took place and we re-stated our common strong position of non-recognition of the annexation of Crimea.*

*The second principle is strengthening relations with our Eastern Partners and other neighbors, in particular in Central Asia, and we had very good discussions on how to proceed in this respect.*

*Third, strengthening internal European Union resilience, in particular in view of energy security, hybrid threats, and strategic communication, but not only.*

*The Fourth principle we all agreed on is the need for selective engagement with Russia, both on foreign policy issues – this is clear, when it comes to Iran or the Middle East Peace Process or Syria, but also DPRK, migration or counter-terrorism, climate change – but also in other areas where there is a clear European Union’s interest.*

*The fifth of our guiding principles is the willingness to support more and more the Russian civil society and engage and invest in people-to-people contacts and exchanges and policies that are related to that, with a particular view to the youth of Russia and the youth of the European Union because we see the future of our countries as something we need to invest into.”*

Translated into plain English, this means that the EU is determined to:

1. Continue to punish Moscow for the non-implementation of the Minsk-2 Agreement by Kiev
2. Continue to try to surround Russia with hostile regimes in Europe and Central Asia
3. Continue to accuse Russia of being a threat to Europe
4. Hope that Russia will ‘selectively engage’ the EU where it is to the EU’s advantage
5. Continue to support the 5<sup>th</sup> column inside Russia

In the words of Mogherini, adopting these principles "was not a difficult discussion". Unlike issues of immigration or terrorism, on Russia, the Europeans apparently agree. This is disgusting, to say the least.



In the meantime, the Russian Duma's Deputies stood for a minute of silence in homage to the murdered victims from the latest attack, while scores of Russians, including Foreign Minister Lavrov, brought flowers to the Belgian embassy in Moscow. They did the right thing, of course, but deep in their hearts, most Russians are also quite aware that when Russians were murdered by the hundreds by Wahabi terrorists no EU parliament had any minutes of silence and none of the predecessors of Mrs. Mogherini shed any tears. As was so obscenely shown following the Charlie Hebdo murders, in Europe some lives are more precious than others. Nothing new here.

It is well known that thugs always carefully choose their victims whom they want to be unaware of their surroundings, easily frightened into submission, inclined to try to appease any enemy and generally unable to offer a determined resistance. Daesh, like all terrorists, very much shares that kind of mentality and in Europe; they have found the *perfect* victim. Europe is intellectually, financially, politically, socially and morally bankrupt. The European society is unable to reform itself, its ruling classes are unable to inspire any kind of real national security strategy and Europe will remain an easy target for future terrorist attacks. I personally see no future for Europe whatsoever until the people of Europe finally force the current *comprador* elite - who have totally sold out to the Anglo -Zionists - out of power and replaces them with real patriots capable of defending the interests of the people of Europe.

It is ironic that the Ukrainian slogan "Україна – це Європа!" (The Ukraine is Europe) has, in reality, been reversed and instead of the Ukraine becoming like Europe, it is Europe which became like the Ukraine: weak, corrupt, unable to formulate a policy beyond obeying Uncle Sam, completely delusional about her real capabilities and a Petri-dish for all sorts of terrorists.

It is hard to believe, but most countries in Europe are slowly turning into what is usually called a “failed state”. Here is one definition of this concept: “A failed state is a political body that has *disintegrated to a point where basic conditions and responsibilities of a sovereign government no longer function properly. Likewise, when a nation weakens and its standard of living declines, it introduces the possibility of governmental collapse.*”

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Failed\\_state](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Failed_state)) Europe is not quite there yet, but the writing is on the wall and it will get much worse before it gets better again.



# Saker Rant about a Stolen Europe

March 26, 2016

My latest column about Europe has elicited a lot of reactions, more than I expected, and I feel that I have to follow up by answering some of the comments made and by simply sharing with you, not so much my thoughts as my feelings about Europe and her plight. Careful here, ***this will be an angry rant, written with sadness and despair in my heart, and with no regard whatsoever for good manners or political correctness*** (or spelling and grammar, for that matter).

If you offend easily, stop reading now. Same thing if you expect a carefully written analysis.

This will be a \*rant\*.

You have been warned!

For those who might not already know this, I was born in Switzerland in 1963 and, as most Swiss people do, I traveled all over Europe for many years. My favorite destinations were mostly in the South: Greece (Athens, Aegina, Aghia Marina), Spain (Gran Canaria, Andalusia, Madrid), Italy (Ansedonia, Rome, Milan, Aosta), France (Creuse, Corrèze, Vercors), but also in the \*real\* “Central Europe” of Switzerland (Bernese Oberland, Graubunden, Val Poschiavo), Germany (Bavaria), Holland (Amsterdam, The Hague) and Belgium (Brugge). I even had some wonderful trips to Ireland (Dublin, Donegall, and Connemara) and I loved it all. I loved the languages (I speak Spanish, German, French, Italian), I loved the beautiful diversity of people, the music, the food, the landscapes, the accents and beautiful buildings as witnesses of the past reaching as far as antiquity – all these were joys to my heart and food for my mind. I absolutely LOVE Europe, and not only because by ethnicity I am half-European myself (my father, who

did not raise me, is Dutch) but because most of my life was spent there and, no matter what, Europe will feel like home to me.

[Sidebar: when I say “Europe” I mean Western Europe, the real Europe, the one which was occupied by NATO, not the eastern part, occupied by the WTO (Warsaw Treaty Organization - it was never called a “Pact” – this is US propaganda), which never was really Europe anyway. No offense to anybody, but for me the notion that Poland or Bulgaria are part of Europe is laughable. And neither are the Balkans for that matter, with the possible exception of Greece. I know, most will disagree and prove me wrong, I don’t care. MY Europe will always be a purely Western one, for better or, sometimes, for worse].

But that home was stolen from me.

First, that home was stolen by an EU project which from day one was anti-European. How is the EU anti-European? First and foremost, because it was aimed at unifying a beautifully diverse continent. What does a German and an Italian have in common? Let me tell you: exactly \*nothing\*. In Switzerland, we used to joke that the border with Africa began in Carouge, a southernmost neighborhood of Geneva. If you asked a Swiss German from Zurich, he would say that the border with Africa begins just south of Bern, on the linguistic divide between German and French speaking Swiss. And, please, don't see that as a sign of anti-Italian or anti-French-speaking Swiss racism – it is not. It was a \*joke\*, but one which reflected real differences.

There once was a real and viable European (as I said, every time I say "European" I mean "West European") core: Germany,

France, Belgium, Holland, and Denmark were fairly close to each other, with France being the odd man out. France is, at the very least, two countries: southern and northern France, glued together by history and language. Switzerland was politically too independent to ever join this "core". As for the UK, it was never European in the least. If anything, the UK was always anti-European and the worst enemy of Europe.

The EU went much further. It added Spain, Italy, Greece and Portugal. This was already rather crazy but, I suppose, painfully doable. But then came the death blow: adding all of the former WTO countries in a suicidal expansion to the East. I don't feel like discussing what the central and eastern European countries ought to be called, maybe "Eastern European" is okay, but they never were in any way part of western Europe. Yes, for political reasons, the Poles, Estonians and Romanians think of themselves as "European", but just like the Ukies with their ridiculous "Україна – це Європа!" (The Ukraine is Europe) they never were part of real Europe, not the one which used to joke that the European border with Africa begins in Carouge anyway ☺

The second deathblow to Europe came when the capitalists opened the borders of Europe to cheap immigrant labor from the South. Let me tell you, the first wave of immigrants, mostly Italians, Portuguese, and Spaniards, could very easily be integrated. I went to school with roughly 50% of the classroom composed of these three groups. Sure, they each had their own identity, language, and customs – but they could really be integrated into the larger society. Then came the Yugoslavs and it was much tougher already. All of them – Serbs, Croats, Albanians from Kosovo – had come from Communist Yugoslavia and while they definitely worked very hard, they never really felt at home in their new country of residence, and neither did the locals see them as their own. But then all hell broke loose with the arrival of the

“Arabs” from the Maghreb (northern Africa) who were not all, or even really, “Arabs” but never mind that, and sub-Saharan (Black) Africans. Can you imagine what it feels like to see \*real\* Africans in larger and larger numbers all over your hometown when you used to joke that the border with Africa was Carouge (I repeat that example because I consider it very telling)? **It felt like a plague, even if nobody was willing to admit it.**

Now let me immediately get one canard out of the way; the issue of Islam.

I submit that none of the Maghrebians or Africans could be really integrated into a profoundly West European society. But, and this is crucial; the Muslims, and here I mean the really religious and pious Muslims, were always respectful of the law and excellent neighbors. I know what I am talking about as I lived right next door to a big mosque, for decades, and I know for a fact that mosque-attending Muslims are extremely courteous (more so than the locals, in fact) and that they are very careful about showing a refined, educated and proper image of Islam in front of non-Muslims. The real plague was the 2nd generation kids who were neither Europeans nor Muslims. Now those, especially the Algerians, accounted for the vast majority of crime and they were truly a horror to put up with: arrogant, loud, uneducated and very aggressive. These Maghrebians typically would mix with 2nd generation Black Africans and form the core of almost all the gangs of criminal thugs roaming around. And none of them, zero, were Muslims in any sense of the word, not religious not cultural. Again, I speak of long and personal experience, so please don't come tell me that I don't know Europe or Islam, because I do, very well in fact.

[Sidebar: I cannot speak of Turks/Kurds in Germany simply because I have not spent enough time

in these circles and I am not qualified to have an opinion about them].

So my Europe was stolen from me not once, but twice and while I weep over the Europe of my youth, I absolutely loathe the Europe of the European Union. Every time I see Hollande, Stoltenberg or Tusk, my stomach turns and I feel like cursing. They make me absolutely sick. I hate the Europe of Charlie Hebdo, of BHL, of Harlem Desir, the Europe of Conchita Wurst or of Dalia Grybauskaitė (there goes a typical European name, right?).

London now looks like Karachi, Paris like Ouagadougou, and Rome like Târgu-Mures. This is absolutely disgusting, revolting and suicidal. To say so has absolutely nothing to do with racism and only a person totally devoid from any real cultural roots can misinterpret the horror of those who see their cities and cultural roots being smashed by waves of non-integratable immigrants as a form of racism.

You don't believe me?

Let me tell you this: in France there are a lot of Maghrebians who are now horrified to see their (usually poor) neighborhood being literally run over by Romanian Gypsies while in Switzerland you have Yugoslavs who have more or less integrated who now watch in horror as their putatively "fellow" ex-Yugoslavs run the cocaine business. How many Swiss citizens do you think you would find in a Swiss jail? Nobody knows, but my guess is less than 15%.

The worst part of it all is that both the Right and the Left are equally responsible for this state of affairs.

Originally, the main impulse to bring immigrants to Europe came from the Right, from the organized corporate managers who wanted cheap labor at any cost. As always, if you look deeper, the

forces behind the corporations were the banks. It is no coincidence that in France it all began with Georges Pompidou who, before being President, was a General Manager at N. M. Rothschild & Sons Bank. Pompidou, who came to power following the CIA's "color revolution" known as "Mai 68" succeeded a real French patriot, General de Gaulle, who had attempted to de-couple France from her AngloZionist masters and who was subsequently overthrown in a bizarre revolution which already saw Trotskyists and CIA agents working hand in hand to achieve regime change in France.

All the French Right cared for was profit, profit, and profit. The French workers were superbly unionized, they had achieved remarkable social and labor rights and the French capitalists simply could not turn them into the kind of right-less workforce they needed, so they imported them from abroad.

As for the Left, it saw in this influx of immigrants a fantastic political opportunity to achieve the kind of societal changes it always wants to achieve: a wholesale destruction of any form of tradition, national identity, and religion.

The French Zionists, in particular, saw a fantastic opportunity to weaken the French national identity by branding it as "by definition" racist. This is how they did it.

President François Mitterrand wanted to split the French Right in order to win the election, so he personally ordered the main French TV channel to make a long interview with the leader of the National Front, Jean-Marie Le Pen. This interview is what really put the National Front in the spotlight and the tactic worked. The French Right was split and it still is, by the way. The French Socialists joined forces with the Israel Lobby and created a movement called "Touche pas à mon pote" (don't touch my pal) headed by a guy called Harlem Desir (I kid you not!). Their mission - to fight the alleged racism of the French people. Sounds



familiar? Create a problem and then 'solve it' ("Zionism 101"). This operation worked superbly and made any discussion of immigration tantamount to racism.

Now that the EU has replaced Europe, the Right and the Left have logically fused into what I call the "Extreme Center" – the same globalist model which, on one hand, wants to eliminate all the borders while, on the other, dismantle all social regulations protecting the working class from exploitation by the Capitalists.

Sorry for this long excursion into the past, but I want you to understand why I am always so angry when I write about "today's Europe": I am angry because I remember "yesterday's Europe" very well, because I saw it killed step by step before my very eyes, because I personally lived through every stage of this slow murder and because I absolutely loathe the pseudo-Europe which the Zionists are building on the ashes of the old Europe.

A few more comments:

**Gladio:** yes, I know about Gladio, I remember the bombing in Bologna and the kidnapping of Aldo Moro. Could the latest bombings be a Gladio v2? Yes, absolutely, but this in no way impinges on the fundamental thesis that uncontrolled immigration is a moral threat to Europe and an ideal vector for the penetration by terrorists. Just remember that Daesh is CIA-controlled anyway and that whether the handlers are in Raqqa or Brussels makes no difference. The Takfiris have always been the CIA's foot soldiers.

**The US role:** huge. The EU is essentially a US project via the Bilderbergers and the Zionist lobby in Europe. The EU today is run by *comprador* elite which are totally subservient to AngloZionist interests. What real Europeans wanted was the "Europe des patries" (the Europe of Fatherlands) which de Gaulle advocated. We all know what happened to de Gaulle for daring to oppose the AngloZionist Empire.

**Russia:** this is interesting. I see no *Schadenfreude* amongst Russians, none at all. First, most Russians simply like Europe, especially southern Europe with which we feel a much stronger connection. But we also admire the northern Europeans for their undeniable achievements. Furthermore, Russians know, through their own bitter past, that good people can live under a disgusting regime. This is also why Russians don't usually blame regular US Americans for the policies of the ruling 1%. But what bothers Russians the most is the abject servility of most Europeans in front of an abject regime. The Great Russian philosopher Ivan Solonevich used to write that "the Germans are not better organized, they are easier to organize". What he meant by that was that under the Nazis or under the US occupation, the Germans would be exceptionally obedient and *willing to be ordered around*. In contrast, the Russian people are far more freedom loving and even anarchistic and they always rebel against any authority they don't respect.

[Sidebar: Dubious about this? Consider this: the Germans actually elected Hitler and then obeyed him up until his death. In comparison, the Soviet regime came to power in 1917 but only achieved stability in 1946(!) after a huge civil war, many insurrections, bloody repressions, bloody purges and a terrible war which saw, for the first time in Russian history, millions of Russians switch sides. Even after 1946 – the year of the last big wave of repressions – the Soviets still feared their own population up to 1991; and for good reason, I would add].

I personally expect that the first explosion against the EU will come from France, a country which, like Russia, has a deep, almost

visceral, attachment to freedom and which will, I am certain, eventually blow up. When that happens, it will be violent and bloody (alas, another French – and Russian – tradition). I think that the AngloZionists will go to unimaginable levels of depravity and dishonesty to prevent it, but my money stays on France as the first country in the EU to rise up against the Empire. Why? Because the other candidates, Greece, Spain or Italy, will always "look over their shoulders" whereas the French will simply explode in a rage with no regard to the consequences (in that the French are much more like the Russians). Plus the French will always hate the Anglos anyway.

**Islam:** Fact 1: Muslims are here to stay. You can hate it or love it, but that is a fact. Fact 2: Islam, real Islam as opposed to Wahabi Islam, is categorically opposed to Anglo-Zionism. I think that Islam will be one of the forces which will eventually help to "clean house" in Europe. Wahabism, on the other hand, will have to be completely and totally eliminated from Europe. This is a mortal threat to all of civilized mankind, a threat which cannot be negotiated with and which must be totally eliminated.

**The Ottomans:** Call me crazy, but I am coming to the conclusion that Turkey, at least in its present form, is inherently a dangerous and nonreformable entity which must be beaten back to a size and quality commensurate with the notion of "normal country". Just look at the past couple of decades. The Turks were involved in Cyprus, Kurdistan, Chechnia, Bosnia, Albania, Macedonia, Crimea, Lebanon, and Syria! How is that for a terrorism-support scorecard? Does anybody remember that Turkey does still occupy half of Cyprus and that the Turkish military has been bombing and attacking Kurds in Syria and Iraq for decades already? Clearly, the "imperial virus" has not been eradicated in this ex-Empire and this rot must be eliminated until Turkey finally becomes what all other former empires have

become: a normal country, like Greece or Holland. By the way, the only thing which currently keeps Turkey together and gives it a kind of immunity is, of course, the protection of the United States and NATO aka the AngloZionist Empire. Get rid of one, and the other will soon follow.

**The \*real\* Left:** there used to be a real Left in Europe. And, unlike the modern ‘Caviar-Left’ it was really patriotic. The French Communist Party leader Georges Marchais saw through the Capitalists plan to import masses of immigrants and he denounced that as a conspiracy against both the local French and the immigrants. Some of his speeches sounded very similar to what Jean-Marie Le Pen has repeated for decades. The real left has now been completely eliminated from Europe or, if it exists somewhere, it is too small to make a difference.

**The \*real\* Right:** The National Front of Jean-Marie Le Pen used to be the real deal, even if it was carefully manipulated by the French Socialists. But ever since his daughter Marine came to power, the National Front has been totally co-opted by the Zionists and from a popular and labor movement it has now turned into the typical Capitalist pseudo-Right which has sold out to the system and is unable to even peep a word against the Zionists. There is a real Right left in France, mostly around Traditionalist "Catholic" (Latin) circles but, just as with the real Left, it is too small to really make a difference.

Sorry for this long rant. My heart hurts over this topic and it is painful for me to write about. Please don't come and pester me about spelling or grammar or other inexactitudes. I wrote this in one shot, off the cuff, and at the kind of warp-speed typing I do when I am emotional about something (heck, I won't even bother re-reading it or check for typos). Though I will post this under the "analysis" section, I do that only because this is a follow-up to my analysis yesterday. But, as you can tell, an analysis this is not – this

is just a frustrated and angry rant about what has been done to the place where I was born and which I still love.



# The EU's "Suicide by Reality Denial"

April 07, 2016

What had to happen did happen. The EU, being the chain of weak links that it is, did eventually give in, and the Dutch people were the first ones to vote against the association with the Ukraine. Of course, the Euroburocrats can now find some reason to declare the vote invalid, they can declare that some law was violated, they can even negotiate some minor change to the association agreement, or they might even decide that they can simply ignore this vote. But none of that will make any difference: the undeniable truth is that the Ukrainians are not welcome in the EU, not as associates and even less so as members. So, no EU, no NATO, no "European future" for the Ukraine. The entire hot air balloon which has been fueling the naïve and ugly hopes of the Euromaidan has burst and the Euro-Ukrainian project is crashing and burning like the Hindenburg.

This disaster did not have to happen, it was entirely man-made. In a saner world, the EU, Russia and the Ukraine could have negotiated a tripartite deal which would have given the Ukraine the role which geography and history have given it: to be a bridge between Russia and the EU. But the EU categorically rejected this option, several times, simply declaring that "*the Ukraine is a sovereign state and Russia has no say in Ukrainian matters*". This zero sum game was forced on Russia against her will but now it is the EU which has lost it all, even if this is by no means a victory for Russia either. The sad reality is that everybody has lost. Now the EU has to accept the total defeat of its Ukrainian policy, Russia is now alone looking at a dying failed state right across her border, while the Ukraine is simply falling apart and dying a painful death. Will the Euro bureaucrats accept this outcome?

Probably not.

They will do what they have always done. They will lie, deny, minimize and, most importantly, pretend like nothing has happened. They will say that 60% of 30% of a small EU nation do not get to make decisions for the entire continent. Or they will declare that instead of just an old fashioned “association” the EU will offer the Ukraine something much better – a “heartfelt friendship” maybe. Or a “love eternal”. Or even a “continental brotherhood”. But that will all be in vain because the people of Europe are clearly weary of the Ukronazis - even their Polish “friends” are now considering building a wall of their own, (<http://sputniknews.com/europe/20160226/1035376921/poland-ukraine-migrants.html>) to keep their “Ukrainian friends” out of Poland; feel the love!

### **Consequence one: financial costs**

But it is way too late for the Europeans. The really bad news for them is that they will have to pay most of the costs of more or less rebuilding the Ukraine. Russia simply cannot do it. Her economy is way too small, and she is already struggling with trying to restore law and order in Crimea (which is proving very hard, as the local mob is already trying to return to the way it operated under Ukrainian control). Furthermore, Russia will have to pay for the Donbass, that is pretty obvious. So Russia is really maxed out.

The US could pay, but won't. Even if Hillary is elected (aka appointed by the US ‘deep state’), such a huge economic rescue program for the Ukraine will never pass Congress, not when the US themselves are in need of a similar program to rebuild their own decrepit and neglected infrastructure and economy.

But most importantly, Russia does have the means to close her borders. The newly created Russian National Guard (<https://www.rt.com/politics/338512-putin-national-guard->

terrorism/) will now take over the responsibilities of several ministries and agencies including the Federal Migration Service. Russia already has a very capable Border Guard Service which is subordinated to the Federal Security Service (ex-KGB). It is estimated (<http://100-000-pochemu.info/id/1578>) that the Border Guard Service currently includes 10 regional offices, 80+ border units, 950+ outposts, 400+ checkpoints. Every day the service conducts 11,000 patrols. In total, the task of preservation and protection of borders of the Russian Federation is carried out by about 200,000 border guards. This service has its own air force, coastal navy, UAV, intelligence directorate, armored units and even its own Spetsnaz forces. The reality is that the Russian Border Guard Service is more powerful than most EU armies. And now it will have the full power of the National Guard to back it. Make no mistake, Russia can, and will, if needed, lock and protect her borders.

As for the USA, they have the best border protection on the planet: the Atlantic and Pacific oceans.

So when the Ukraine turns into a black hole (the process is well under way) the only ones who will not be able to protect themselves but who will have the means to pay to fix this mess will be the Europeans. Yes, sure, the US and Russia will also have to help, and they both will, for different reasons. But the bulk of the costs will go directly to the European taxpayer. That is the price the EU will have to pay, sooner or later, for its arrogance and incompetence.

### **Second Consequence: security**

There will also be another price to pay, this time a price in security. All the NATO saber-rattling along the Russian border did, eventually, wake up the “Russian bear”. Not only has Russia now deployed her formidable Iskander missiles in Kaliningrad, she has



now doubled the size (<http://thesaker.is/2014-end-of-year-report-and-a-look-into-what-2015-might-bring/>) of her already formidable Airborne Forces. (<http://thesaker.is/a-look-into-the-modern-russian-airborne-forces/>) Here is what I wrote about that in December 2014:

*“The Russians have no fear of the military threat posed by NATO. Their reaction to the latest NATO moves (new bases and personnel in Central Europe, more spending, etc.) is to denounce it as provocative, but Russian officials all insist that Russia can handle the military threat. As one Russian deputy said, “5 rapid reaction diversionary groups is a problem we can solve with one missile”, a simplistic but basically correct formula. As I mentioned before, the decision to double the size of the Russian Airborne Forces and to upgrade the elite 45th Special Designation Airborne Regiment to full brigade-size has already been taken anyway. You could say that Russia preempted the creation of the 10,000 strong NATO force by bringing her own mobile (airborne) forces from 36,000 to 72,000 (<http://www.janes.com/article/41665/russia-to-double-size-of-airborne-forces>).*

*This is typical Putin. While NATO announces with fanfare and fireworks that NATO will create a special rapid reaction “spearhead” force of 10,000, Putin quietly doubles the size of the Russian Airborne Forces to 72,000. And, believe me, the battle-hardened Russian Airborne Forces are a vastly more capable fighting force than the hedonistic and demotivated multi-national (28 countries) Euroforce of 5,000 NATO is struggling hard*

to put together (<http://www.wsj.com/articles/nato-struggles-to-muster-spearhead-force-to-counter-russia-1417459067>). The US commanders fully understand that.

But that is not all Russia did. Putin has ordered the re-creation of the ultimate Cold War Russian armor threat: the First Guards Tank Army.

(<http://www.janes.com/article/57828/russia-completes-reformation-of-1st-guards-tank-army>).

This Tank Army will include two Tank Divisions (the best ones in the Russian military – 2nd Guards Tamanskaya Motor Rifle Division

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2nd\\_Guards\\_Tamanskaya\\_Motor\\_Rifle\\_Division](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2nd_Guards_Tamanskaya_Motor_Rifle_Division))

and the 4th Guards Kantemirovskaya Tank Division),

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/4th\\_Guards\\_Kantemirovskaya\\_Tank\\_Division](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/4th_Guards_Kantemirovskaya_Tank_Division))

and a total of 500+ T-14 Armata tanks. This Tank Army will be supported by the 20th Guards Combined Arms Army.

Make no mistake, this is a huge, heavy and powerful force whose purpose will be very similar to the famous Soviet “Shock” Armies ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2nd\\_Shock\\_Army](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2nd_Shock_Army)) during WWII and the Cold War: *“overcome difficult defensive dispositions in order to create a tactical penetration of sufficient breadth and depth to permit the commitment of mobile formations for deeper exploitation”*.

Bravo Europe – you just painted a giant crosshair on your forehead!

Very little of that is reported in the Western media, of course, and so the general public is utterly unaware of the fact that while NATO and western politicians pretended to play tough and tried

to scare Russia, the Russians decided to take these threats seriously and took real, practical action.

For somebody like me who lived through the Cold War and who used to monitor the Soviet Forces in Eastern Germany, it is both distressing and sickening to see that the West has literally forced Russia into a new Cold War she neither wanted nor needed. Of course, I am absolutely confident that there is no "Russian threat" in the East, and the only way to get this entire military power to strike would be to attack it first, but the sad reality is that the EU/NATO countries are now directly targeted by Russian forces.

To make it all that much worse, there is now a strong possibility that Hillary and her Neocon gang will soon take over the White House. God only knows what these people are capable of. Hillary, whose only "success" in life seems to have been to push Bill to bomb the Serbs and make an ugly mess out of Libya, will have something to prove: that she is more of a man than Putin. She will try to scare and bully him into some kind of submission and never mind that the Russian people now see the West as a degenerate, if arrogant society of Conchita Wurst-like poseurs who simply do not have what it takes to fight a real fight and who can only pick on the weak and humble. It is not fear which the Neocons inspire in Russians, but disgust. At most, they can elicit a sense of concern due to their seemingly infinite arrogance and self-defeating lack of foresight. As I have written many, many times already, Russians do fear war, no doubt about it, but unlike the AngloZionists, they are nevertheless ready for it.

As for the Europeans, they are now slowly coming to realize that they are in for a long and very painful war against Wahabi terrorism. The attacks in Paris and Brussels are just the opening shots of a war which will last many years. It took Russia over a decade to finally crush the Wahabi terrorists in the Caucasus, and

that was with a man like Vladimir Putin at the helm of the country. One look at Francois Hollande or Angela Merkel and you can feel in your guts that these two sad clowns will never prevail. Just contrast the reaction of Vladimir Putin to the downing of the Russian airliner over the Sinai with Frederica Mogherini's sobbing following the bombings in Brussels.

Now imagine that you are a Wahabi terrorist leader and a hardcore lifelong sexist, I would add, and that you are looking at the photos of the Defense Ministers of Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands and Germany (all women). Then take a look at a photo of The Defense Minister of Russia. Would this influence your selection of targets?

Of course it would.

The same goes for the comparison of the US/NATO operations in Syria with the outcome of just under six months of Russian Aerospace forces. States, just like people, have their own "body language" and while the body language displayed by Russia is one of confident and formidable power, the body language of the EU and, to a marginally lesser extent, the USA is one of weakness, hubris, and incompetence, often bordering on the suicidal (like Merkel's policy on immigration).

### **The Bottom Line**

The bottom line of this mess is this: what the US and the EU did in the Ukraine (and elsewhere, really) was fantastically stupid. But the US can afford such mistakes, while the EU clearly cannot. As for Russia, yes, she most definitely has been hurt by these policies, but this pain has been channeled by the Kremlin to make Russia stronger on many levels, from the political, to the military and even the economy, although here the progress has been minimal and the 5th column is still very much in charge. (<http://thesaker.is/putins-biggest-failure/>) I remain hopeful of a much-needed purge.

What the EU has done is essentially a form of “*suicide by reality denial*”. What follows next will have to be regime change, not for one country, but for the entire continent. I think that such regime change is inevitable, but the big question is how long this slow and painful EU agony will last. Alas, this could take many years, I think. EU leaders will not elegantly apologize and resign, there is an entire class of parasites which now lives off the EU structure which will desperately resist any meaningful reforms, never mind regime change, and which will always put their narrow *comprador* class interests above their people or even common sense.

As for the people of the EU, they will find out that they don't have the means to impose political change by the ballot, that they live in a pretend-democracy, and that everything they have been told and promised is just an empty, ugly, lie. The Ukraine did not become Europe, but Europe became the Ukraine.

Welcome to the real world, EU!



# The Controversy about Stalin – A “Basket” of Preliminary Considerations

April 11, 2016

When introducing Jimmie Moglia’s video series about Stalin (<http://thesaker.is/the-life-of-stalin-by-jimmie-moglia/>) I promised to share with you my own take on this most controversial personality. Let me immediately say that what I will write below is most definitely not some seminal analysis of the life and personality of Stalin, but rather a few more or less disjointed thoughts on a topic which I still feel that I do not understand.

The figure of Stalin has always been a controversial one. Some thought of him as the “leader of all times and all nations” (“вождь всех времен и народов”) while others saw him like the epitome of evil, a genocidal maniac who killed more people than any other individual in history. In reality, that kind of polarization is probably a strong indication of the fact that this issue is a very complex one and that a simple black and white answer is unlikely to correctly evaluate the person of Stalin and his legacy. The fact that there really was a “personality cult” during Stalin’s life and that it was followed by an emotional denunciation by Khrushchev only made things worse. Stalin is most definitely a polarizing figure and I myself have been submitted to that polarization from my early childhood.

I write an anonymous blog, and I always say that what matters is not who people are, or have been, but what they have to say, their ideas. But in this case, my own views have been so strongly polarized that at the very least I have to honestly admit and explain them before proceeding any further.

I was born in a family of Russian refugees who left Russia at the end of the civil war. In Soviet parlance we were what were

called 'недобитые белобандиты' a term I would roughly translate as "escaped White-bandits" or "not executed White-bandits". Whatever the preferred translation, this was hardly a term of endearment, to say the least. And the feeling was very mutual. Not only was my family full of "White Guards", my own grandfather joined the Russian Schutzkorps in Serbia.

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russian\\_Corps](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russian_Corps))

After the war, my family immigrated to Argentina where, I would argue, probably the most virulently anti-Communist part of the Russian emigration typically re-settled. While I myself was born in Switzerland where my parents had moved (Swissair was hiring pilots in the early 1960s), I was raised a rabid anti-Communist and I was involved in so many anti-Soviet activities that one day a KGB officer in Spain made a death threat against me (he did not have the authority to do so and was, in fact, severely punished by his own people for that – but that I only learned later). To make a long story short, for most of my life my feelings about Stalin were very much similar to what many Jews today feel about Hitler: total absolute hatred, disgust, and rejection. Followers of this blog know that, to put it mildly. I have had to reconsider most of what I have believed for years and, to some degree, this also affects my current views (however tentative and unformed) about Stalin. I am basically torn between two mutually exclusive “thought currents”:

The first one is one which is best represented by Alexander Solzhenitsyn whom I still consider to be the most important Russian author and philosopher of the 20th century and who has had a huge impact upon, not only my own worldview but even upon my entire life. While nowadays pro-Stalin authors like Starikov like to smear and discredit him, I simply know too much about this man and his immense corpus of writings (which I have read fully at least twice) to accept such characterizations. For me Solzhenitsyn very much remains the living embodiment of the

Russian soul and a real “giant” whose powerful voice was the last expression of the pre-Soviet Russia which formally disappeared in 1917 but which continued to survive clandestinely in the Soviet Union right up to 1991. This being said, Solzhenitsyn was not infallible and while I still accept most of what he said, some of his conclusions are, in my opinion, most definitely wrong (such as his views of Socialism and the Left in general). Here is what he actually wrote (<http://rg.ru/2012/11/26/gulag.html>) in his famous Gulag Archipelago about Soviet terror:

*“According to estimates by exiled professor of statistics IA Kurganov, from 1917 to 1959, and excluding war losses, only from terrorist destruction, suppression, hunger, the high mortality in the camps, and including the subsequent low birth rate, cost us 66.7 million people” (“The Gulag Archipelago”, part 3, Chapter 1).”*

And in an interview in 1976 Solzhenitsyn said: *“Professor Kurganov indirectly calculated that from 1917 to 1959 only from the internal war of the Soviet regime against its own people, that is, the destruction of its famine, collectivization, peasant’s deportation to prisons, camps and simple executions – just from these causes we lost, together with our civil war, 66 million people”*

These figures INCLUDE the bloody Civil War, the so-called “War Communism“ ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War\\_communism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/War_communism)), the numerous anti-Bolshevik insurrections (such as the one in Tambov) ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tambov\\_Rebellion](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tambov_Rebellion)), the deaths resulting from the so-called “Collectivization”



([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collectivization\\_in\\_the\\_Soviet\\_Union](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collectivization_in_the_Soviet_Union)),  
and “Dekulakization“  
(<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dekulakization>),  
the “pure” political repression under the infamous Article 58  
([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Article\\_58\\_\(RSFSR\\_Penal\\_Code\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Article_58_(RSFSR_Penal_Code)))  
of the RSFSR Criminal Code and even the subsequent low birth rate.

So we are talking about a “grand max” estimate. But there are some problems with such figures. I will name just one truly glaring one.

There is a general consensus amongst pro and anti-Soviet historians that some of the most vicious and horrible political repressions in the Soviet Union took place between 1934 and 1937 when the secret (political) police was headed by two truly demonic figures, Genrikh Yagoda

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Genrikh\\_Yagoda](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Genrikh_Yagoda))

and Nikolai Ezhov

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nikolai\\_Yezhov](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nikolai_Yezhov)).

And yet, the so-called “Great Purges” (1936-1938)

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great\\_Purge](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great_Purge))

also covers the time when the famous Lavrentii Beria

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lavrentiy\\_Beria](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lavrentiy_Beria))

became the head of secret (political) police. But ask yourself, if these are “purges” then what exactly was “purged”? The peasants? The clergy? The petty bourgeois or maybe the nobility? Not at all, it was the Party and, first and foremost, the secret (political) police, i.e. *exactly the people who were guilty of the atrocities committed between 1934 and 1937*. In fact – a lot of them were specifically executed for treason, abuse of power, illegal executions, etc. So how can the figures of those who were executed by the Soviet state during the 1934-1937 years be lumped together

with the figures of those who were, in turn, executed precisely for having committed these atrocities?! This would be as illogical as counting the hangings of the Nuremberg trials as “Nazi atrocities”!

Furthermore, we need to at least mention one crucial factor here: Trotskyists. I have already written about this in the past (<http://thesaker.is/how-a-medieval-concept-of-ethnicity-makes-nato-commit-yet-another-a-dangerous-blunder/>) and I shall not repeat it all here again. But let's just summarize it all by saying that there were at least two main factions struggling against each other inside the Bolshevik regime: the Trotskyists, which were mostly Jewish; which had a rabid and even racist hatred for the Russian people and Orthodox Christianity; who had the full support of the West, especially Western financial circles (Jewish bankers); and who basically ran Soviet Russia from 1917 to 1938 when Stalin and Beria directed a terror campaign aimed at finally ridding the Party from the many Trotskyists it still contained (even if Trotsky himself had lost power in 1927 and left the USSR in 1929). In order to purge the Party, Stalin brought his own, trusted, Georgians (like Beria himself) and together they unleashed a brutal campaign to crack down on those who had themselves been in charge of terror just a few months before.

By the way, this was not the first bloody purge conducted by Stalin. Before crushing the “old” secret (political) police Stalin first used it to conduct an extremely violent and bloody purge of the Soviet Armed Forces including its most famous figure, Marshal Mikhail Tukhachevskii, and his family. I won't go into the details of these purges, but I will say that I fully agree with “Viktor Suvorov” (aka Vladimir Rezun)

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Viktor\\_Suvorov](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Viktor_Suvorov))

who, in his amazing book “The Cleansing” makes the case that Stalin was absolutely correct in purging the Soviet military of these generals and officers before WWII (for those who can read

Russian, you can find this book online here: <http://tululu.org/b54600/>).

So what Stalin did is this: he unleashed the Bolshevik "old guard" (i.e. Trotskyists) against the military and once the military was purged, he then unleashed his own "new guard" ("Stalinists") against the Trotskyists and purged the Party of most of them. Very, very ruthless indeed; but, in all honesty, also very smart. Think of it this way: Stalin had inherited a Party which was full of rabid, treasonous and simply crazy elements and a party which was still full of Trotskyists (which makes sense, as more than anybody else Leon Trotsky should be "credited" with creating the Soviet military, winning the Civil War and crushing all internal opposition in a huge campaign of Russophobic terror). Stalin turned this Party into a Party run by one man, himself, one which had purged itself from the Trotskyists foreign agents and one which had the ideological flexibility to actually appeal to the Russian people to fight off and, eventually, defeat the Nazi invaders during WWII. I think that you don't have to "like" Stalin to see that while his methods were, no doubt, ruthless, his results were rather impressive: not only did he win WWII, but in spite of the terrible cost in human lives and destruction he turned a bloodied and severely battered Soviet Union into a world power with a powerful economy, absolutely world-class scientific community and a remarkable high standard of living during the years of recovery.

The big issue here is one of costs, especially in human lives. Frankly, and whatever the real figures are, there is no doubt in my mind that the costs were huge. The Stalinists can now say whatever they want and seek to rationalize these horrors in many ways, but there is no doubt in my mind that Stalin did not mind sacrificing millions of people in the process of what he saw as the greater good. The way in which he, and Marshal Zhukov, sent

millions of people to die in desperate and, often, futile attempts at crushing the German *Wehrmacht* is something which can be rationalized, but not denied. Still, the Stalinists have a powerful counter-argument: could a kind and gentle person like the Czar Martyr Nicholas II have prevailed against Adolf Hitler? I don't have a reply to this, but I admit that the argument is compelling.

Another powerful argument the Stalinists bring up today are the internal Soviet figures about the number of people actually executed by Stalin. Here it gets interesting.

The Russian Wikipedia has a long article entitled "Stalin's Repressions" ([https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Сталинские\\_репрессии](https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/Сталинские_репрессии)) which has not been translated by the English Wikipedia which offers only a very superficial and, frankly, biased article on people executed during the Great Purges). Here is what the Russian Wikipedia says (Google machine translation, slightly corrected by me):

*"In February 1954 a reference document was prepared authorized by a certificate signed by the USSR Prosecutor General R. Rudenko, Minister of Internal Affairs and the Minister of Justice S. Kruglovym K. Gorsheninym USSR, for N.S. Khrushchev. It states that the number convicted of counterrevolutionary crimes for the period **from 1921 to February 1, 1954**, according to the report, only for this period, has been condemned by the Board of the OGPU, NKVD "troika", a special meeting, the military Collegium, courts and military tribunals: 3,777,380 people, including **sentenced to death 642 980; sentenced to incarceration in the camps and prisons with a sentence of 25 years and below - 2,369,220 people; and to exile and expulsion - 765,180 persons.** According to the*

*“Reference document #1 of special department of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs about the number of detainees and prisoners in the period 1921 -1953 gg.” December 11, 1953, signed by the head of the archive department of the Interior Ministry Pavlov, on the basis of data which, apparently, was compiled information aimed at Khrushchev. **For the period from 1921 to 1938, in cases of the Cheka-GPU-NKVD, and from 1939 to mid-1953, for counterrevolutionary crimes, they had only denounced, by the judicial and extrajudicial authorities 4,060,306 people: sentenced to death 799,455 persons; to incarceration in the camps and prisons 2,631,397 people; to exile and expulsion – 413,512 people; and to the "other measures" 215,942 people.** According to this document, all were arrested for the 1921-1938 biennium - 4,835,937 people (a / p – 3,341,989, other crimes – 1,493,948). Of those, have been convicted 2,944,879, of them to capital punishment 745 220. In 1939-1953 has been convicted of a / p – 1,115,247, of which HMB to 54,235 (23,278 of them in 1942 g.). According to various researchers, only for the period from 1930 to 1953, on political charges was arrested from 3.6 to 3.8 million people, of which shot up from 748 786 000 [149] [155] [156]. The main peak of the shooting came in the years of the "Great Terror", where 682,684 thousand people were executed. In total in 1918-1953 gg., according to the statistical analysis of regional departments of the KGB of the USSR, conducted in 1988, the bodies of the Cheka-GPU-NKVD-NKGB-MGB, 4,308,487 people were arrested, of whom 835,194 were shot.”*

Now let me immediately say that what matters here are not the exact figures, but the order of magnitude: fewer than 5 million people were executed, i.e. less than 1/10th of the 66 million figure Prof. Kurganov quoted from Solzhenitsyn. Of course, *this is a typical case of apples and oranges* as, on one hand, Kurganov speaks of deaths (and even unborn) from 1917-1959 while the figures above are only about people officially and legally executed and incarcerated 1921-1938/51/54. And, again, neither figure makes any difference between those who were innocent of their crimes and those who very much deserved to be executed for the atrocities they had themselves committed.

At this point, I don't think it makes sense for us to dwell on these figures too much. Personally, I have come to the conclusion that I don't want to fall into the same trap that so many Jews have, with their ridiculous insistence that "6 million Jews" were killed by the Nazis or that gas chambers were used to kill them. *There is a real risk for those Russians like myself who were raised in families who hated Stalin with all their heart and souls to sacralize the "66 million" figure and that is a trap I want to avoid.* However, there is another danger here, the one of minimizing the number of people murdered by Stalin (or Hitler, for that matter). It would be wrong or, at least, premature, to conclude that because there is very strong evidence that 66 million figure (or the 6 million one) are incorrect that Stalin (or Hitler) did not murder an immense number of people. Since I have personally known people who have endured the atrocities of Stalin's (and Hitler's) camps there is no doubt in my mind at all that a huge number of people have suffered terribly under the rule of these two dictators.

So we are left with unpalatable questions like "*how much is too much?*", "*was the result worth the costs?*", "*should the man or the system he inherited be blamed?*" and, most importantly – "*what*

*about all the others?*“. And I don’t mean Hitler here, but genocidal war criminals like Winston Churchill or Harry Truman or, more accurately, the United States and Great Britain whose genocidal record of atrocities makes the Bolsheviks look almost reasonable. Just as Ivan IV “The Terrible” ought to be compared with such “gentle” folks as Henry VIII of England (not called “The Terrible” for some reason) or Catherine de’ Medici ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Catherine\\_de'\\_Medici](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Catherine_de'_Medici)) (who instigated the Saint Bartholomew Massacre) ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/St.\\_Bartholomew's\\_Day\\_massacre](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/St._Bartholomew's_Day_massacre)). The horrible truth is that at the Nuremberg Trials, the accused had much less blood on their hands than the accusers (in all fairness, they also had much less time to commit their own genocidal atrocities). None of that is meant as a way to excuse or exculpate Stalin, of course, but only to remind us all of the abominable contexts in which Stalin's life and rule took place.

One thing is absolutely clear to me. There never was any such thing as “Stalinism” – at least not in the sense of some special, uniquely evil or massive period of atrocities. At most, Stalin’s ideas could be referred to “Stalinism”, especially when contrasted to the ideas of Trotsky, and I would say that having read them both, Stalin comes out as the far less brilliant but much more pragmatic and reasonable one. Whichever may be the case, nowadays “Stalinism” is used, at least in the West, as a metaphor for the “ultimate evil” and that is simply and plainly counter-factual and wrong.

In Russia, something very different is taking place. In some circles, Stalin is becoming rather popular. In fact, I would argue that Stalin has always remained popular in the Soviet Union, even after the so-called “revelations” of the 20th Party Congress

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/20th\\_Congress\\_of\\_the\\_Communist\\_Party\\_of\\_the\\_Soviet\\_Union](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/20th_Congress_of_the_Communist_Party_of_the_Soviet_Union)) and Khrushchev's (not-so) "secret speech"

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/On\\_the\\_Cult\\_of\\_Personality\\_and\\_Its\\_Consequences](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/On_the_Cult_of_Personality_and_Its_Consequences)).

[Sidebar: I don't have the time and space to go into this sordid story now, but let me just summarize it by saying that Stalin was murdered by his entourage and that in order to take control over a shocked Soviet Union, Khrushchev embarked on a massive anti-Stalin smear campaign while concealing that he himself was one of the worst executioners of the Stalin era; Khrushchev was a fantastically immoral and despicable figure and one of the most incompetent Soviet leaders ever. He, no less than Gorbachev, ought to be blamed for the inevitable collapse of a system he did so much to weaken].

For all the anti-Stalinist propaganda during the Khrushchev years and all the anti-Stalinist propaganda in the 1990s, most Russians remain acutely aware of the undeniable achievements of the Soviet era in general and of the prosperity Stalin eventually did bring to the Soviet Union in spite of the huge damage inflicted upon the USSR by WWII. But there is also a trap here.

The human mind has a tendency to dismiss everything a known liar and a crook says, just as we don't pay much attention to what people we otherwise dislike might claim. The problem with that is that while Khrushchev and Yeltsin both betrayed their own Party and were dishonorable people, not all of their arguments were false either. Likewise, those who see through the current propaganda about "6 million" and "gas chambers" have a risk to



therefore conclude that everything about Hitler's genocidal atrocities is just a myth, that millions of innocent people were not murdered by the Nazi regime. Sometimes, I find myself stuck with an intense dislike for both sides of a debate (say on issues such as abortion) and considering that Stalin is most vociferously discussed by Western Capitalists, Trotskyists, Neocons, Russian 5th columnists, rabid Russian nationalists and many more categories which I intensely dislike, at times it is hard to try to separate the argument from the person making it.

Some groups in Russia are outright “mental”. The worst in the lot are the rabid Russian nationalists who think of themselves as Orthodox Christians and who actually believe that Stalin was, I kid you not, a Christian saint!!! I will spare you the full fairy tale these folks have come up with, but their bottom line is that at one point in Stalin’s life he remembered his early education as a student in an Orthodox seminary and that he began to “resurrect Russia” at which point, you guessed it, “the Jews” killed him. They refer to him as “*святой мученик Иосиф жидами убиенный*” or “holy martyr Joseph killed by the Jews”.

But then, there is also a psychopathic fringe who considers Ivan the Terrible a saint too. And Rasputin, why not? Frankly, their entire “theology” is pathetically simple: Russians are the best, all the Russian leaders are great, and any figure in Russian history perceived as negative is, of course, the object of a smear campaign, preferably by “Jews” and almost *ipso facto* a “saint”. This kind of rabid nationalism is just a crude form of self-worship and idolatry which is absolutely antithetical to real Christianity.

I would not pay too much attention to these rather marginal if exotic groups of, frankly, deranged people. They really are a tiny minority, even smaller than the pro-western “non-system” opposition.

What is far more prevalent is what I think of as the "Reconciliation" movement. These are folks who think roughly like this:

*We need to heal the divisions resulting from the Soviet era because both the Whites and the Reds were patriots. We need to stop this tendency of rejecting large chunks of our history and set aside the bad and keep and preserve that which was good. Anti-Russian forces have, for centuries, used lies, deception, and propaganda to smear our history and we need to reclaim it. If you look carefully you will always realize that the anti-Soviet activist (антисоветчик) is always a Russophobe.*

Let me begin by clearly stating that the last sentence is patently false and it also completely contradicts the first one. Not only have I personally known hundreds of virulently anti-Soviet Russians, the vast majority of them were 100% patriotic. And if you read what the White Generals, participants in the Russian Civil War, and Russian émigrés wrote, you will see that they all loved their country, their people, their history, and their culture. Likewise, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, the epitome of anti-Sovietism, was always a Russian patriot; to such a degree in fact that he was considered as a "Grand-Russian nationalist" and "anti-Semite" by the Russian liberals.

Furthermore, the notion of "reconciliation" between the Whites, who represented the traditional, monarchist, Orthodox Russia, and the Reds; who were rabid atheists, mostly ethnic Jews and who hated everything Russian is absolutely nonsensical. The reality is that the Red and White "principle" in Russian history are mutually exclusive and their ontological relationship is similar to the one of healthy tissue and a malignant tumor: they share a lot of the same genetic code, but one will always end up killing the other.

And yet...

And yet there is some wisdom in these words nonetheless or, maybe not in these words, but at least in the intention they convey. For some, this "reconciliation" is really a pious way to cover up the atrocities committed by their Party, their country or even their own family. For others, it is a legitimate expression of a refusal to completely demonize complex personalities who lived in complex times and whose legacy still has to be examined by generations of historians rather than remain in the hands of professional propagandists. And for that, a simple but crucial principle needs to be proclaimed and accepted:

***The quest for the historical truth is never a lack of respect for the horrors suffered by the victims.***

That, I sincerely believe, is what should be the guide to the future historians who will always have to re-visit and re-evaluate the events of the past. The sad reality is that it is extremely difficult to investigate the past, even the recent past (just think of events like 9/11, the "Timisoara massacre" or the "Srebrenica genocide"! ). To make things even worse, it is also a sad reality that history is mostly written by the victors and, as Michael Parenti so brilliantly explains it, by the rich and powerful. It is precisely for these reasons that *historiography has to always remain revisionist* as a non-revisionist history book simply is not interesting to read.

I think that following WWII the victors all engaged in a shameless campaign of demonization of their enemies. That is not to say that these enemies were not real demons in their own right – maybe they indeed were – but only that while for the newspapers and so-called "educational" system, the cases of Stalin and Hitler are considered "slam dunk, file closed" but for serious historians the jury is very much still out. There is simply too much at stake

and the political climate is simply not conducive at all to any generally fair and honest investigation.

Personally, I am left with a sense of not knowing enough. So all I can share with you is my gut feeling, my best guesstimate if you want, of what Stalin and the Soviet era represented for Russia. So here are my highly subjective and personal conclusions which I share with you as a basis for discussion and not as The Total and Final Truth on this issue.

1) The historical Russia was murdered and completely destroyed by the Bolshevik/Soviet regime. There is no continuity of any type between the rule of Czar Nicholas II and the Lenin-Trotsky duo. Therefore, there is no continuity between what came before and what came after these two Bolshevik leaders. The post-Soviet "Russia" after 1991 had nothing in common with the real Russia of before 1917. As for Putin's Russia, the Russia after 2000, it is a new Russia; a Russia which is neither the pre-1917 one, nor the "democratic" pseudo "Russia" of Yeltsin, but a new Russia whose real nature I still have to comprehend and which absolutely amazes me. In my wildest dreams during the horrible 1990s, especially 1993, I would never have imagined seeing what I see in Russia today and this gives me a great deal of hope. This new Russia has much stronger roots in the Soviet period than in the distant pre-1917 Russia, but what it has finally truly ditched is the rabid Russophobia of the early Bolshevik years and the equally rabidly Russophobic of the 1990s. And that is really interesting because nowadays you will find monarchists, like Alexander Rutskoï

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexander\\_Rutskoy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexander_Rutskoy)),

and Stalinists, like Nikolai Starikov

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nikolai\\_Starikov](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nikolai_Starikov)),

generally agreeing on the present even if they don't agree about the past. Speaking for myself, as a "People's Monarchist" (a kind of

uniquely Russian Left-leaning monarchism embraced by Fedor Doestoevskii, Lev Tikhomirov or, especially, Ivan Solonevich) I also find myself in agreement with much of what Starikov writes except for his book on Stalin which I find absolutely unconvincing, to put it mildly. So this is something new, I think. I do not believe that the "Reds" or the original Bolsheviks were Russian patriots at all; I believe that this is a total myth. However, *I do believe that those who today believe in this myth are themselves sincere and real patriots.* So while I don't believe that it is possible to find any common ground or "reconciliation" between the White and the Red principles, I do very much believe that there is a real opportunity for a joint stance of Russian Patriots today against the real enemy of Russia: the AngloZionist Empire.

Take a look at this amazing picture: the ex-prisoner of the Gulag shakes hands with the ex-KGB officer. True, Putin was only a foreign intelligence officer member of the First Chief Directorate (PGU) of the KGB which had nothing to do with any purges, dissidents or Gulags, but he still wore the same uniform as those KGB officers who kept a watchful (and mostly incompetent) eye on the Russian people (the Fifth Chief Directorate). So this handshake is immensely symbolic: not only did Solzhenitsyn receive Putin in his own home, but his entire face was beaming with real joy (as was Putin's). These men were both educated and intelligent enough to realize not only the immense power of this symbolic moment but they also realized what this meant for Russia: that real Russians (in the civilizational sense, of course, ethnically the category "Russian" is meaningless) were finally back in control of their own country.

Solzhenitsyn lived long enough to see his country liberated (at least mostly) from the occupation of Russophobic leaders representing foreign interests and he also saw that a fellow officer (Solzhenitsyn was decorated First Lieutenant of the Red Army before his arrest in 1945) was now in command of the country.

I think that Putin strikes the exact and correct balance. He has never rejected the Soviet period *in toto*, nor has he ever idealized it either. He has referred on numerous occasions to the horrible and senseless massacres of a multitude of innocent Russian people by a Soviet regime run amok with Russophobia and class-hatred. And yet he has also shown his sincere respect and admiration for the people who lived during the Soviet era and their immense achievements.

2) There is a misguided attempt at completely white-washing Stalin and the entire Soviet period. This is not surprising by itself. The vast majority of the modern Russian elites have direct family ties to the Soviet elites and the infamous Soviet “nomenklatura” (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nomenklatura>). It is only natural for these people to want to justify the actions of their family members. While there are millions of Russians whose families did suffer terribly during the Soviet era, a much smaller proportion of these families made it into the Soviet elites and, therefore, into the new, post-Soviet elites which run Russia today. There are some exceptions, of course, mostly families of rehabilitated Party members who, following this rehabilitation, have kept their loyalty or, at least, respect, for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU). Finally, the millions who were murdered rarely left many children behind and, when they did, those children were themselves the object of repression as “class enemies” and “anti-Soviet families” so their voice has almost been totally drowned in the current loud chorus of “Soviet-rehabilitators”. Again, this kind of back-swing of the pendulum of historiography is normal, but it will inevitably be followed by another swing which will produce much more critical results. God willing, and with time, the correct evaluation will finally be made. But maybe it never will – it is too early to tell.

3) I feel confident saying that Stalin was most definitely no worse than his predecessors and that in many ways, the nature and policies of the Soviet regime did change for the better under his rule. Still, I remain convinced that he was a ruthless leader, who lead the country by a careful mix of terror and inspiration and who did not hesitate to sacrifice millions of people when needed to achieve a goal he had set. I am also pretty certain that it was during Stalin's rule that the first Russian Patriots made it back into the structure of power and that this slow and gradual re-penetration continued under Khrushchev, Brezhnev and the rest of the Soviet leaders until 1991. And if the 1990s were an absolute horror, it is to those Soviet-grown Patriots (after God, of course!) that modern Russia owes her amazing rebirth. Sure, as we all know, good things can grow in bad places, but I have to believe that at least something in the Soviet society was right to have produced such remarkable leaders as the ones in the Kremlin today.

Modern Russia has nothing in common with the Russia between 1917 and 1953. So to speak of a possible return to “Stalinism” is not only wrong, it is absurd. This also means that Stalin's policies, whether seen as good or bad, are simply not transferable to modern Russia. And that, in turns, means that the discussion about the historical past, the nature and legacy of Stalin's rule, will not have a major impact upon the decision-making of Russian leaders. And this is a very good thing, because it makes the entire discussion rather abstract and, therefore, safe. Starikov and Zhirinovskii (a radical anti-Communist who despises Stalin) can argue to their heart's content about Stalin or monarchy (which the self-described Stalinist Starikov respects and cherishes), but when faced with the conflict in the Ukraine or Syria these debates will have very little impact on the Kremlin's decisions.

So while I remain extremely critical of Stalin and of the whole Soviet period, I think that the current de-demonization of Stalin is

a very good thing and I very much hope that it will give historians the *intellectual and ideological freedom* they need to do their work. For the time being, I'd rather step aside and wait to read more of their books

**Your turn now – please tell me what you think about Stalin and his role in history!**





# A Negative View of Christianity and Religion in General

May 03, 2016

We live in a post-Christian society, not only because truly religious Christians are now in a small minority, but also because culturally and spiritually our society has almost completely severed any links it once had with the original Christianity of the early Church. One of my favorite quotes of all time is "*God created man in His image and man returned Him the favor*". This aphorism is so good that it was attributed to Mark Twain, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, George Bernard Shaw, Bertrand Russel, Frank Wedekind and Voltaire. I think that this sentence contains the best overall summary of what Christianity is in the 21st century. What I want to do today, is to express a few negative views about Christianity and about religion in general. When I say "negative", I don't mean to say bad things about it, but rather to say what it is *\*not\**. Believe it or not, this is an ancient form of theological discourse called "apophatic"

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apophatic\\_theology](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Apophatic_theology)) or "negative theology" (as opposed to "cataphatic" or "positive theology") – a theology which rather than describing what God is, attempts to describe Him by saying what He is not. What I want to do is to apply the same methodology to the concept of religion in general and to Christianity in particular, and describe what it is not. I won't go into lofty and abstract theological issues though, but keep it as simple and straightforward as I can.

Of course, by stating what it is not, I do imply that what Christianity was/is something objective and not just the product of a social consensus or the opinion of a majority of people, but something which can be described, but not redefined or shaped by

an opinion. In other words, there was/is a “True Christianity” which is “true” in the Slavonic understanding of the word Istina or the Hebrew Emet (see <http://thesaker.is/absolutely-amazing-discussion-of-the-meaning-of-the-word-truth-according-to-4-cultures/> for an explanation of "truth according to content"). However, it is not my purpose today to describe it positively, if only because that is something infinitely more complex and subtle than to describe what it is \*not\*.

### **The three "levels of religious satisfaction"**

One of the greatest Orthodox theologians of the 20th century, Father Lev Lebedev, used to say that people find three kinds of “satisfactions” when they go to church: a spiritual level, a psychological level, and an emotional level. What he meant is that different people attend religious services for different reasons – some seek a prayerful interaction with God, others find solace from their suffering while others feel uplifted by the aesthetic beauty of the religious ceremony itself. Father Lev correctly stated that ideally, one ought to experience all of these different levels at the same time because they are complementary and not mutually exclusive. Father Lev was describing what he observed as a cleric of the Orthodox Church in Russia in the 1980s and 1990s and I think that this somewhat limited his view of the matter. What I would like to attempt now is to describe other reasons which make people identify themselves as Christians/Orthodox and which have absolutely nothing to do with real religion, Christianity or Orthodoxy.

## Religion as a basis for ethical values

A lot of people nowadays generally approve of the so-called “Christian values” which are basically the Ten Commandments and the various ethical guidelines derived from them: not to steal, not to lie, to be kind to others, to be truthful, to live a life of modesty, to be faithful, etc. These are the folks who will say that religion plays a positive moral and educational role in society, that a non-religious society will inevitably lose a sense of right and wrong, that high ideals are needed to live a worthy life. The “need” for that kind of religion is simple: as Dostoevsky said “if there is no God all is permissible” – there is simply no logical way to define “right” and “wrong” unless you can “peg” these concepts to an absolute, transcendental source/origin of your definition. Stealing is not logically inherently bad – it is bad because “God said so”. I think of this as the “utilitarian God”: we invent ourselves a “God” who just so happens to tell us to live according to the principles we like. You think I am exaggerating? Okay, let me give you a simple example: think of all the folks who condemn Islam for allowing the death penalty for certain actions and who say “how can a religion practice capital punishment? This is so inhuman – I don’t accept that”. Notice that these people never ask themselves a simple and basic question: what if God happens to approve of the death penalty? That they don’t care about. These people don’t reject Islam because they don’t believe that there is a God or because they don’t believe that Mohamed is His prophet – they reject Islam because they don’t like what Islam teaches, irrespective of the existence of God or whether Mohamed was, or was not His prophet. These are the same kind of folks who reject Latin Christianity for not allowing divorce or birth control: they simply *reject any religion whose teachings do not coincide with their own* – and to hell (pun intended) with any objective reality. These are

exactly the kind of people who “create” themselves a “God” in their own image.

## **Religion as a form of national self-definition**

Do you know the difference between a Serb, a Croat and a “Bosniac” (i.e, a Muslim from Bosnia)? Their religion. That is not to say that there are no other differences between these South Slavs or that you cannot be a Serb, a Croat or a “Bosniac” and an atheist or, say, a Buddhist. But the root cause, the core of the historical development of differences between these three groups most definitely originates in the fact that Croats are Latins (i.e., “Roman Catholics”), the Serbs Orthodox Christians and the “Bosniacs” Muslims.

Remember that nationalism is really a 19th century West European invention and that in most of mankind’s history people defined themselves according to their place of birth (in a local sense, village, town), according to their allegiance to a leader (Emperor, feudal lord, tribal leader, etc.) and, sometimes, according to their religion. For example, the Ottoman Empire recognized the Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople as the “head of the Roman nation” (*rum millet*) or “*millet bashi*” as an ethnarch whose authority extended over all the Orthodox Christians of the Ottoman Empire *regardless of their ethnic or linguistic affiliations*. You could be Armenian, Persian, Arab or Serb – if you were Orthodox the “*millet bashi*” spoke for you and was your leader.

As for the much-suffering Gagauz people (Turkic Orthodox Christians) ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gagauz\\_people](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gagauz_people)); they were originally considered as “Greeks” by the Turks only to be thought of as “Turks” by many Greeks in the 19th century.

Another example: in the Russian Empire, Karaites ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karaite\\_Judaism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karaite_Judaism))

were not considered as Jews. In fact, the Russian Empire never discriminated against people on the basis of what we today would call their "ethnicity" but defined their "nationality" on the basis of their religion. In fact, many Russian Czars were mostly of German "ethnic" stock.

Today Empires are gone, but from Ulster to Bosnia and even to Russia, religion has now become a form of national identity: "I am Orthodox because I am Russian" or "I am a Muslim because I am a Kazakh". My personal reaction to this kind of "religious patriotism" is that these people really worship *themselves*. Think of it: any real religion should, in theory, be universalistic: if we are all the creatures of the same Creator and children of the same Father, then we are all brothers and sisters and our ethnic, cultural, linguistic or regional idiosyncrasies should be completely irrelevant to the profound spiritual bond attaching us all to each other.

This is exactly what Malcolm X saw after his pilgrimage to Mecca where traditional Islam made him abandon all his racist views about "blue-eyed White devils" and all the rest of the nonsense preached by the pseudo-Islamic sect of the "Nation of Islam" and Elijah Muhammad.

This is also why German Nazis could not accept the unambiguous teaching of the New Testament about Jews: *There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus* (Gal 3:28); *For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free and have been all made to drink into one Spirit* (Gal 5:6); *Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God* (1 Cor 7:19); *For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit* (1 Cor; 12:13)

The sad but also inevitable reality is that in every single case of “religious nationalism” religion is always subservient to nationalism and religion is really an ancillary means towards a much more important nationalistic goal: to proclaim some kind of “*imprimatur* from God” to a rabid form of nationalism and, really, self-worship. As if God was busy with, or even interested in, our petty nationalistic agenda!

One wonderful Ukrainian Orthodox priest once told me “*how can I think of nationalist issues when the angels are standing next to me at the altar!*” And he was absolutely right of course. Religious nationalists are also the kind of people who “create” themselves a “God” in their own image.

## **Religion as an ideological tool of statecraft**

The two forms of “utilitarian religion” above are often combined into one particularly insidious form of pseudo-religion which sees the people in power using religion as an instrument to foster patriotism and social responsibility.

Sadly, there is a lot of that in modern Russia. Communism, at least in its Soviet form has been pretty much rejected, at least by most people, and Capitalism’s reputation is now road kill in modern Russia. Oh sure, some Communist/Socialist ideals are still very much respected and proclaimed and most Russians want to have the opportunity to have their own business and make good money. But neither Communism nor Capitalism can play the role which Orthodoxy played in Russia before the 17th century or the Marxist ideology played during the Soviet era. This is why you very often will see Russian politicians say that “Russia needs a national idea”. This is not a spiritual vacuum, but an ideological one and, sadly, the “official” Russian Orthodox Church (aka the “Moscow Patriarchate”) has been more than willing to fill this

ideological vacuum. As a result, political officers have often been replaced by priests, official ceremonies now almost always involve a clergyman and the "Patriarch" is now playing a very important political role. In many ways this has been a very positive development because this gives the Russian people a possibility to explore their own, individual feelings and interest towards religion in general and Orthodoxy specifically, but this also has an extremely deleterious effect on the millions of potential Orthodox Christians who are turned away from this form of Orthodoxy because of its obvious subservience to the State, its agenda, and policies. You might say that there is no reason for the Moscow Patriarchate not to support Putin, and I would agree but, alas, this is also what the Moscow Patriarchate did under Yeltsin and even the Soviet leaders.

As a result, the situation of Orthodox Christianity in Russia is very similar to the one of Latin Christianity in South America: real piety is mostly confined to the parish level while everything above this level is permeated, at various degrees, by politics and cynicism. As I have already described in a past article

(<http://vineyardsaker.blogspot.com/2013/02/russia-and-islam-part-two-russian.html>),

by the late 1920s Russian Orthodoxy was split into at least 4 major branches (to which one could also add several Old Rite denominations)

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russian\\_Orthodox\\_Old-Rite\\_Church](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russian_Orthodox_Old-Rite_Church))

and the only reason why the branch which is currently considered as "official" was chosen (by the state and during the Soviet era!) as the "right one" is that it was absolutely and 100% loyal to the Soviet state just as it is now loyal to the new Russian state. Yes, total subservience to a secular state power as a "criterion of Orthodoxy"

is, sadly, the only reason why the Moscow Patriarchate is recognized as the “official” Orthodox Church today.

I would note that this is not just a Russian problem – it is exactly the same in many other officially “Orthodox” countries, especially in Eastern Europe (Romania, Bulgaria). By the way, we can also observe the same phenomenon in much of the Muslim world where political regimes get to decide which branch of Islam is considered as "correct" and which one is to be confined to jails. And just as in the Orthodox Church, we see "official" Islamic institutions issue exactly the kind of fatwas which the state needs in support of its policies.

Of course, none of the above has anything to do with Christ or Mohammed and, furthermore, none of the above has anything to do with religion as such. This is just a typical manifestation of religion as a tool of statecraft which Marx and Lenin had identified a long time ago. Where Marx and Lenin were, of course, wrong is when they said that all religions must be like that, that religions are inherently a tool of political control. The history of Orthodoxy and Islam are both full of examples of Bishops and Sheikhs and even entire religious hierarchies “rendering unto Caesar what belongs to God”

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Render\\_unto\\_Caesar](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Render_unto_Caesar))

and “serving two masters“

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Matthew\\_6:24](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Matthew_6:24)).

But you will also find amazing examples in Orthodoxy and Islam where religious leaders openly and courageously defied the worldly powers (I think of Patriarch Hermogen of Moscow,

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Patriarch\\_Hermogenes\\_of\\_Moscow](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Patriarch_Hermogenes_of_Moscow))

or Husayn ibn Ali

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Day\\_of\\_Ashura](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Day_of_Ashura))).

This is nothing new and has nothing to do with religion: it is a profoundly human phenomenon which can be found throughout



history and in every place where there is power. Power does indeed corrupt, and it also corrupts religious leaders.

In the West, this tendency to replace a mystical Christianity with a form of “sacralized secular domination” began almost immediately after the fall of Rome and the Western Roman Empire (in 476 AD) and the subsequent separation of Frankish-controlled Rome from the rest of the Roman Christian world (in 1054) which outlived Rome by a full millennium (until 1453 exactly). In 1075 already the Papacy adopted an amazing document which became known as the *Dictatus Papae* (or Papal Dictation) and which contained 27 principles which had never ever been part of the teachings of the Early Church and the Church Fathers. Here is the full list: Source: ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dictatus\\_papae](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dictatus_papae))

1. That the Roman church was founded by God alone.
2. That the Roman pontiff alone can with right be called universal.
3. That he alone can depose or reinstate bishops.
4. That, in a council, his legate, even if a lower grade, is above all bishops, and can pass sentence of deposition against them.
5. That the pope may depose the absent.
6. That, among other things, we ought not to remain in the same house with those excommunicated by him.
7. That for him alone is it lawful, according to the needs of the time, to make new laws, to assemble together new congregations, to make an abbey of a canonry; and, on the other hand, to divide a rich bishopric and unite the poor ones.
8. That he alone may use the imperial insignia.
9. That of the pope alone all princes shall kiss the feet.
10. That his name alone shall be spoken in the churches.

11. That this title [Pope] is unique in the world.
12. That it may be permitted to him to depose emperors.
13. That he may be permitted to transfer bishops if need be.
14. That he has the power to ordain a clerk of any church he may wish.
15. That he who is ordained by him may preside over another church, but may not hold a subordinate position; and that such a one may not receive a higher grade from any bishop.
16. That no synod shall be called a general one without his order.
17. That no chapter and no book shall be considered canonical without his authority.
18. That a sentence passed by him may be retracted by no one; and that he himself, alone of all, may retract it.
19. That he himself may be judged by no one.
20. That no one shall dare to condemn one who appeals to the apostolic chair.
21. That to the latter should be referred the more important cases of every church.
22. That the Roman church has never erred; nor will it err to all eternity, the Scripture bearing witness.
23. That the Roman pontiff, if he has been canonically ordained, is undoubtedly made holy by the merits of St. Peter; St. Ennodius, bishop of Pavia, bearing witness, and many holy fathers agreeing with him. As is contained in the decrees of St. Symmachus the pope.
24. That, by his command and consent, it may be lawful for subordinates to bring accusations.
25. That he may depose and reinstate bishops without assembling a synod.
26. That he who is not at peace with the Roman church shall not be considered catholic.

27. That he may absolve subjects from their fealty to wicked men.

Every one of these new rules is in total and categorical contradiction with the preceding 1000 year long history of the Church, which used to be called "Catholic" because not only of its universal nature, but because it was based on conciliar (all-including) meetings where all bishops were considered equal and no authority was recognized as superior to such a council of bishops.

Just two decades after cutting itself off from the Christian world, in 1054, the Pope declared himself some kind of “super-absolute-bishop”, in 1075, something unheard of before, and then soon thereafter, in 1096, the Papacy declared its first ‘crusade’. ***Does anybody really think that this is a coincidence?***

And lest anybody believe that this is a fluke and that Pope Gregory VII was just one insane person, I would add here that he was Gregory VII that was beatified by Pope Gregory XIII in 1584 and canonized in 1728 by Pope Benedict XIII so this is very, very “official” stuff, not just the lunatic ravings of a single megalomaniac. This is why Fedor Dostoevsky’s Grand Inquisitor (<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/8578/8578-h/8578-h.htm>) has the audacity to silence Christ Himself and say to Him “*Thou hast no right to add one syllable to that which was already uttered by Thee before*”: because the Papacy has always considered itself above God (and His Church).

This is no different than the no less megalomaniacal claim of Pharisaic Talmudism (aka “Orthodox Judaism” in official modern parlance)

(<http://thesaker.is/off-topic-but-apparently-needed-judaism-and-christianity-back-to-basics/>)

that a rabbi can “argue with God”,

(<https://scholarsbank.uoregon.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1794/5298/Arguing-with-God.pdf>),

win the debate, and even rule over Him and “fix his Creation”

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tikkun\\_olam](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tikkun_olam))

and rule over Him!

(<http://rabbiarthursegal.blogspot.com/2009/06/rabbi-arthur-segalmy-children-have.html>)

It is really no surprise that Pharisaic Talmudism eventually degenerated to the crude religion of “Holocaustism”

(<http://robertfaurisson.blogspot.com/2009/03/secular-religion-of-holocaust-tainted.html>)

- overt self-worship of the Kabbalistic concept of “collective Messiah“

(<https://livingwisdom.kabbalah.com/what-messiah>).

I think I can already hear the militant secularists proclaiming that all this is typical of the “God delusion“

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_God\\_Delusion](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_God_Delusion)),

that religion is a psychopathology which inevitably produces the kind of horrors I have described above. To them, I would just say that for all their real crimes, religions still favorably compare to modern secular and putatively “Enlightened” ideologies (from the Masonic French Revolution to Marxists class warfare to modern Capitalism) whose “atrocities scorecard” goes in the hundreds of millions. Those who believe that religions cause atrocities simply fail to understand that religions always bring *people* together and that *people* always behave in a violent way, including religious people. What makes religions different is that they at least offer a rationale to renounce violence (our common brotherhood in God) and an explanation for our tendency to use violence (our fallen nature). Yes, religions have been used by states to justify atrocities, but that use of religion is, of course, a misuse of religion clearly condemned by Christ (render unto Caesar...). However, **what has**

*made religions so susceptible to such misuse has been their own gradual departure from what a real religion ought to be into a man-made product filled with all the inherent sins and mistakes of mankind.*

## **The modern "ecumenism" of pseudo-religions**

In the beginning of this article, I did say that I would not discuss what Christianity (and religion in general) really is and that I would only describe what it is not. Still, at the very least, I have to mention a few key characteristics of early Christianity which can still be found in various parts of the modern Orthodox world and which set it apart from the rest of the so-called "Christian world". What I would like to do next is to show what makes modern religions so profoundly similar to each other and what makes early Christianity so different from modern religions.

In a recent article for the Unz Review (<http://www.unz.com/ishamir/three-churches-summit/>) Israel Shamir wrote the following:

*“In my eyes, Catholic Church is the Church of the West, while the Orthodox Church is the Church of the East. Each church has its own garden to tend, its own traditions and ways. The East likes its priests bearded, the West prefers them shaved. The East likes them married, the West likes them married to the church. The East has no single head and spiritual leader: every national church is equal to its sister church. The West has the Pope. The East takes for Eucharist its leavened bread mixed with wine, the West prefers unleavened bread for all, with wine for the clergy only. Such differences are normal and do not prevent the churches’*

*rapprochement (...). The biggest theological difference is filioque...*"

which is so obscure that few worshippers understand or care."

Shamir, who was writing in the wake of the meeting between the Pope Francis and Patriarch Kirill is absolutely correct: this minimal list of rather superficial "differences" is pretty much all that separates the modern and official types of Orthodoxy and Latin Christianity embodied by these two clerics. But if the meeting had taken place not between Pope Francis and Patriarch Kirill but, say, the Abbot of the Esphigmenou

(<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Esphigmenou>) monastery on Mount Athos or the Rector of the International Seminary of Saint Pius X (<http://www.seminaire-econe.ch/gbcom/>) in Ecône, Switzerland, the list of differences between the two religions would have been far longer and substantive. It would have included a long list of irreconcilable dogmatic differences (the *doxa*, including the very concept of a super-bishop like the Pope) and an equally long and substantive list of differences in which Orthodox and Latin Christians live their faith on a daily basis (the *praxis*).

While in the recent past some Orthodox and Latin clerics have developed what could be called the "theology of the two lungs" (<http://orthodoxinfo.com/ecumenism/balamand.pdf>)

which declares that the Orthodox Church and the Papacy are the "two lungs" of the Church (which is the *theandric* Body of Christ). The reality is that Orthodox and Latin ecclesiologies (the teaching about the nature of the Church) have been mutually exclusive at least since the 11th century and until the 20th century. Believe it or not, but even "traditionalist" (pre-Vatican II)

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second\\_Vatican\\_Council](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Second_Vatican_Council))

Latins are, from the point of view of traditional (early Church compatible) Orthodoxy *heretics* who have engaged in over one thousand years of innovations and departure from the faith "*which*

*the Lord gave, was preached by the Apostles, and was preserved by the Fathers. On this was the Church founded; and if anyone departs from this, he neither is nor any longer ought to be called a Christian*” (St. Athanasios).

[Sidebar: When discussing theological topics “*heretic*” is not an insult but refers simply to any person who has made a “different choice” from the teaching of the Church. A “heresy” is thus just a “choice” of something different. This can be contrasted with, for example, the word “*schismatic*” which is a person creating a rift/division in a religious organization but without proclaiming any different teaching or dogma. By the way, “*dogma*” simply means “belief” in the sense of “accepted theological tenet”. Finally, the word *canon* simple means a rule, a measure, a standard. Nowadays these words elicit images of pyres, autodafés, witch-hunts, etc., but in reality, these are absolutely necessary concepts to understand even the basics of Christian thought.]

If, from a traditional Orthodox point of view Latins are heretics, then from the traditional Latin view the Orthodox are schismatics who have rebelled against the authority of the Pope and thereby cut themselves off from the True Church entirely. Of course, nowadays, it is highly politically incorrect to say these things; that is why they are replaced by various ceremonies and meetings where the heads of the "official" (i.e. state supported) Orthodox and Latin churches hug and kiss each other, exchange presents and speak of unity. From the point of view of traditional (in the sense of "historical") Orthodoxy and Papacy such displays of mutual affection are not only ridiculous, but they are highly immoral

because they completely obfuscate the real and substantive reasons for the 1000 year long separation between the two denominations (what would Saint Nicholas of Myra have to say to such public hugging?!)

(<http://www.stnicholascenter.org/pages/bishop-nicholas-loses-his-cool/>).

Just to give you a little taste of what kind of language the original Church used in describing interactions with heretics, let me quote from a canon of the Quinisextine Ecumenical Council (691), which both the Latin and Orthodox Churches fully recognized as authoritative, about marriage between Christians and heretics:

*“An Orthodox (in the sense of “right believing” – the Saker) man is not permitted to marry a heretical woman, nor is an Orthodox woman to be joined to a heretical man. But if anything of this kind appears to have been done by any, we require them to consider the marriage null, and that the marriage be dissolved. For it is not fitting to mingle together what should not be mingled, nor is it right that the sheep be joined with the wolf, nor the lot of “sinners with the portion of Christ!” (Canon LXXII)*

Still feel like kissing and hugging? Let me repeat here that officially both Patriarch Kirill and Pope Francis have never repudiated the Quinisextine Ecumenical Council (at least not yet!). Instead, they just don't talk about such "minor and obscure" canons anymore.

Are you shocked by this kind of language?

I can give you an even more shocking example.

All Christians are banned, by no less than the Holy Apostles themselves, to pray with anybody who does not fully and totally share the same exact faith as they do. Yup, both Latins and Orthodox are categorically banned from praying with each other, even in their private homes! Here is the exact quote:



**Canon 10 of the Holy Apostles:** “If one who is not in communion **prays together, even at home,** let him be excommunicated”.

And what about these canons:

**Canon 45 of the Holy Apostles:** "A Bishop, or a Presbyter, or a Deacon that only prays together with heretics, should be excommunicated; if he has permitted then to perform anything as Clergyman, let him be defrocked."

**Canon 64 of the Holy Apostles:** “If a Clergyman or a Layman should enter a Jewish synagogue, or pray with heretics, let him be excommunicated and defrocked.”

Yes, Christians are banned from ever entering a synagogue which, of course, both the Latin Pope and the Patriarch of Moscow have done – they have even greeted the Judaics as “brothers” and the Pope went as far as to declare that they both are awaiting the return of the same Messiah!

Again, I fully understand that somebody would reject Christianity because such canons would offend his/her feelings, but what I don't understand is how those who think of themselves as Christians can either reject or ignore them. After all, these are canons handed down from the Apostles themselves, canons which have been fully endorsed by the entire Christian Church for 2000+ years and which have never been denounced by either the Orthodox or the Latins (for a full list and interpretation of Apostolic canons see [http://www.holytrinitymission.org/books/english/cannons\\_apostles\\_rudder.htm](http://www.holytrinitymission.org/books/english/cannons_apostles_rudder.htm)).

[Sidebar: there is nothing as dangerous as when a novice in the subtle and often paradoxical theological matters grabs a book of canons and begins reading into it all sorts of prescriptions as to how things ought to be

done. Canons are not dogmas, and what is important in them is not the letter, but the spirit. Furthermore, some canons have been deliberately set aside and that is exactly how this should be in a living Church which is not just a collection of old rules. I quote these canons solely to illustrate the language and spirit in which, they were written and to contrast them to the sugary language used in modern pseudo-theological declarations].

Those shocked by what might (mistakenly) appear as the intolerance contained in the examples I give above ought to consider a simple fact: unlike Pharisaic Talmudism (the religion of Maimonides (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maimonides>), Karo ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joseph\\_ben\\_Ephraim\\_Karo](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joseph_ben_Ephraim_Karo)) and Luria ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Isaac\\_Luria](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Isaac_Luria)), aka modern “Judaism”) the spiritual roots of Christianity are truly in the religion of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob: the ancient faith of the Jewish people before Christ and whose foremost Commandment is “*Thou shalt have no other gods before me*”. Replace the word “God” with the word “truth” (two aspects of the same reality, really) and you immediately get a sense of where the apparent “intolerance” of Christianity comes from. For example, the ban on marrying a heretic, even a Christian heretic, is a direct continuation of the ban for Jews taking spouses from other ethnicities. While Pharisaic Talmudism added a racist interpretation for this ban, the traditional Jewish and Christian ban is based on purely spiritual reasons: to jealously preserve the purity of the faith. And this is precisely why the LXXII Canon quoted above goes on to say:

*“But if any who up to this time are unbelievers and are not yet numbered in the flock of the Orthodox have contracted lawful*

*marriage between themselves, and if then, one choosing the right and coming to the light of truth and the other remaining still detained by the bond of error and not willing to behold with steady eye the divine rays, the unbelieving woman is pleased to cohabit with the believing man, or the unbelieving man with the believing woman, let them not be separated, according to the divine Apostle, 'for the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife and the unbelieving wife by her husband.'"*

In that case, the Church does not speak of a "*sheep be joined with the wolf*" but of one spouse "*sanctifying*" the other. To sum this all up I would say that (the real, original) Judaism and Orthodox Christianity (the latter being a continuation of the former) place an immense emphasis on the Truth, on never placing the True and the False on the same level, on never obfuscating the differences between two different teachings.

In contrast, most modern Christian denominations couldn't care less about any truth, be it historical, dogmatic or even factual.

[Sidebar: by "Truth" I mean something very specific. My spiritual father recently defined it as such: "*Truth is not a relative abstract but a cognitive monument formed by revealed absolutes*" and that is as good a definition has I have ever seen]

I even believe that most modern Christian denominations have simply given up on the very concept of "truth" altogether. Their sole concern is expediency really - some vague idea of "practical" as opposed to what is "theoretical", such as any discussion of what the truth might be.

For example, modern Ecumenists will always proclaim that they believe in the same God, the same Trinity, and the same Mother of God and that they therefore "recognize the validity of

the Mysteries (called “Sacraments” in the West) of the other Ecumenists. Contrast that with the difference between the Orthodox and the Gnostics and Arians which could be summed up in two words which differ from each other only by, literally, a tiny letter iota: “*homousios*” versus “*homiouios*” (the former meaning “of the same substance” and the latter “of a similar substance”). Early Christians died because of this “tiny” difference! You can imagine what they would say if they saw Patriarch Kirill and Pope Francis hugging each other and calling each other “brothers in the Christian faith“!

([http://en.radiovaticana.va/news/2016/02/12/joint\\_declaration\\_of\\_pope\\_francis\\_and\\_patriarch\\_kirill/1208117](http://en.radiovaticana.va/news/2016/02/12/joint_declaration_of_pope_francis_and_patriarch_kirill/1208117))

Again, the point is not to discuss the difference between “same” and “similar” substances, but to contrast the difference in approach to issues of faith between early Christians and modern “official” religious leaders.

[Sidebar: This uniquely Christian form of "intolerance" was really bewildering to the pagan Romans who were far more similar to our modern Ecumenists. Most people don't realize that pagan Romans never asked Christians to give up their faith. Neither did they want to force them to pray only to the Roman gods. "All" they wanted was for the Christians to also "honor" the Romans God by bringing them a small sacrifice, sometimes as small as just adding a few coals to the fire of a Roman god. And yet, the early Christians stubbornly refused such seemingly "small" gestures which they viewed as an apostasy because it equated false god with the One Real God. They chose horrible tortures and death rather than even give the external impression that they accepted the reality of Roman

gods. Even those Christians who did not accept to offer a sacrifice to a Roman god but who obtained a certificate stating that they had done so were referred to as "*libellatici*" ("certificate holders") and considered as "lapsed" from the Church!]

So yes, it is true that modern Christians do not care about "obscure theological matters" and that is precisely what makes them so different from the True Christians of the early Church and those Orthodox Christians today who still hold the traditions "which have been passed on to them *whether by word or in writing*" (2 Thes 2:15) and who still remember that even if "*an angel from heaven*" would preach a "*different gospel*" to them that they should reject him as "*accursed*" (Gal 1:8).

While for original Christians "obscure theological matters" were important enough to be tortured to death for, for modern "post-Christian Christians" they were basically irrelevant. They have long forgotten the warning from God "*because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will vomit thee out of my mouth*" (Rev 3:16) and all they care for is the external unity of Christian denomination, never mind if they hold mutually exclusive theological views or even, no theological views at all like the amazing Unitarian Universalists (aka the "youyooohs") ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unitarian\\_Universalism](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Unitarian_Universalism)) who embody syncretism led to its logical conclusion.

## **The ethos of YOLO and DILLIGAF**

At the end of the day, all these modern "decaf denominations" which have really done away with "intolerance" and "zealotry" result in a society where nobody gives a damn anymore, a society where the anti-spirituality of the ethos YOLO

(<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Yolo>)  
and DILLIGAF

(<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=DILLIGAF>)  
provide the basis for endless consumerism and general stupidification. This is the kind of anti-religion which the New World Order needs – a religion which would unite all of mankind into a single, vapid, shapeless mass serving the NWO and its 1% leaders by consuming, obeying and never asking a question, especially about what is or is not true. This is why the powers that be and the media put such an effort into promoting these “official” religions and why they constantly fawn over their leaders.

Think of it – does it not strike you as paradoxical that Christ said *“If the world hates you, ye know that it hated me before it hated you. If ye were of the world, the world would love his own: but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you”* (John 15:18-19) and yet the very same corporate media who serves the AngloZionist Empire and its planned New World Order also would give putatively “Christian” leaders the kind of coverage which normally goes to Rock stars?

When was the last time you ever heard one of those "superstar religious leaders" dare to denounce the modern rulers of our world as the genocidal mass murderers they are or simply as hypocrites? But no, they meet with them and they hug, they smile, they kiss – each time a big love fest. Long gone is the time when Christian leaders had the courage to openly criticize an Empress (like Saint John Chrysostom) or dare to speak to a modern leader like Saint Philip II, Metropolitan of Moscow, who refused to bless the Czar Ivan the Terrible after a church service and instead publicly castigated him in the following words:

*“I don't recognize the Orthodox Czar anymore. I don't recognize him in his rule, O Lord! We are here bringing a sacrifice*

*to God, while behind the altar the blood of innocent Christians is shed. Since the sun shines in the sky it has never been seen or heard that a pious Czar would outrage his own kingdom in such a way! Even if the most impious and pagan kingdoms there is the rule of law and the Truth, and there is mercy towards the people, but not in Russia! You are high on your throne, but there is an Almighty Judge above you. How will you face his judgment? Covered in the blood of the innocent, made deaf by the sound of their tortured screams? Even the stones under your feet are demanding vengeance O Lord! I am telling you as a pastor of souls – fear the One God!”*

Can you imagine an Orthodox Patriarch or a Latin Pope addressing, say, Obama with such words? And while Saint Philip was eventually tortured and murdered for his courage, modern Patriarchs and Popes incur no such risks. And yet they remain silent: they see nothing, hear nothing and, above all, say nothing. YOLO and DILLIGAF indeed...

This is why the Empire and the New World Order loves them.

## **Conclusion – what religion is not**

I have tried to show the various reasons why I consider that most of what is called “religion” today is nothing of the kind. We live in a world of pseudo-everything, an “Empire of Illusions” to borrow Chris Hedges’ expression. Original Christianity was an intensely mystical faith, one which centered on prayer and asceticism, which lead to an intensely personal experience of God and His uncreated energies

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Essence-](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Essence-Energies_distinction_(Eastern_Orthodox_theology))

[Energies\\_distinction\\_\(Eastern\\_Orthodox\\_theology\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Essence-Energies_distinction_(Eastern_Orthodox_theology))

and which was never detached from a zealous determination to preserve the purity of the original faith “*which the Lord gave, was preached by the Apostles, and was preserved by the Fathers*“. Early

Christian monasticism is a perfect example of this “symphony” between individual spiritual struggles and public action in defense of the faith: while in normal times monastics lived in remote locations and deserts, they always left their secluded dwellings to enter the city and publicly defy and condemn any heresy. In modernist Orthodox denominations this kind of individual responsibility has been replaced with a “keep praying, shut up and mind your business” attitude (I have witnessed that myself in the Russian Orthodox Church as recently as the 2000-2007 time period).

Truly, the state of religions today is a sad one and you will not hear me defend it. Christ warned about that when he said “*Ye are the salt of the earth: but if the salt have lost his savor, wherewith shall it be salted? It is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men*” (Mat 5:13). Yes, sure, the modernists currently control all the holy places (ancient churches and cathedrals), courtesy of secular police forces who are more than happy to evict “non-official” denominations from their places of worship, but this was also predicted by Christ when he spoke of the “*abomination of desolation*” in the “*holy place*” (Mat 24:15). There is probably nothing much we, the simple people, can do about that. But what we can do is remember the “real thing” and never allow the modern “verisimilitudinous Christianity” to take its place in our hearts and minds. Finally, we should always remember the words of Christ who told us that His Church was “*the pillar and ground of the truth*” (1 Tim 3:15) and that “*the gates of hell shall not prevail against it*” (Mat 16:18). This means that no matter how ugly and even horrible our situation becomes, God will never let His Church truly disappear from our world. Somewhere, maybe only in a small corner of our planet, His Church will always survive, faithful to the Church of the Apostles and the Fathers, unchanged by all the persecutions and slow motion descent into



apostasy of the rest of the world. And if somebody really wants to find this Church, he/she will. This is also a promise Christ made to all of us: “*Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness: for they shall be filled.*” (Mat 5:6).

PS: I fully realize that the above will deeply irritate and offend some readers. My views are the expression of a culture and a faith which is long gone. You can think of me as an “alien” (<http://thesaker.is/a-small-reminder-and-clarification-i-am-an-alien-really/>) if you want. I have to warn you that the only criticism I really fear is if you told me that in the above I misrepresented the true and original mindset, or *phronema*, of the Church Fathers and of the Early Christians. If I am guilty of that, then I sincerely apologize and repent for it. But if I ruffled the feathers or rattled the cages of the modern “post-Christian Christians” and of the usual gang of religion-hating secularists, then so be it! This is not a popularity contest but simply my personal witness to my readers. Like in an AA meeting, you can take or leave any or all of it :-)



# Counter-Propaganda, Russian Style

May 06, 2016

Listening to the western corporate media one would get the impression that the Kremlin controls all the Russian media with an iron grip and that not a word of criticism of Russia, never mind Putin himself, is ever allowed. So bad is this situation that the AngloZionists are now funding new "information" efforts to counter-act the Russian propaganda machine and bring some much-needed information to the Russian people who clearly do not realize that they are being lied to and deprived of any truthful or even alternative information.

In reality, nothing could be further from the truth.

First, while some Directorates of the KGB have been renamed and reorganized, the Directorate in charge of dissidents, "other thinkers" and assorted ideological "enemies of the state" (the 5<sup>th</sup> Main Directorate) has been disbanded completely. So there is no "ideological police in Russia". Some forms of speech are, indeed, banned – "extremist" speech (terrorism, violence, racism, hate speech, etc.) and some specific organizations, like the Ukrainian "Right Sector" or the Tatar "Mejlis". Other than that, the only control over speech in Russia is based on criminal charges. So, really, Russia is not unique in that matter at all – she more or less does the exact same as European states.

Second, there is \*a lot\* of criticism of Putin and the government in general in a very active RuNet (Russian Internet), not only in Russia but also worldwide (USA, Canada, Kazakhstan, the Ukraine, etc.). Some of the criticism comes from a rather small pro-US minority, but most of it comes from the anti-US camp: nationalists, Communists, and critics of the government economic policies all blame Putin for being too weak and unwilling to

confront the West frontally. Unlike in the Ukraine, foreign media organizations are not banned, and neither are their broadcasts or newspapers.

Third, most of the Moscow-based “money elite” (I don’t want to call them “intelligentsia”) absolutely loathe Putin and his policies, and they are not shy about speaking their minds about him. If you want to test that hypothesis, just talk to wealthy Russian tourists and you will see that, as a rule, they don’t support Putin at all. And, as we know, “money talks” and a lot of Russian money is most definitely opposed to Putin.

But that does not mean that there is no Russian counter-propaganda at all. There is, and it is very effective. But what makes it unique is the way in which it operates.

I suspect that the fantastically incompetent ways in which the 5<sup>th</sup> Main Directorate of the KGB worked to try to deal with anti-Soviet feelings have left a deep mark on the younger generation of state security officers who have learned from these mistakes and have taken a diametrically opposite course: instead of trying to silence the western propaganda – they actually actively promote it!

Yup, that’s right. The Kremlin and the clearly pro-Putin journalists go out of their way to give as much air time to the most rabid anti-Kremlin critiques as possible, especially on Russian TV talk shows.

The most popular Russian TV talk shows (*Evening* with Vladimir Soloviev, *Time will Show* with Petr Tolstoi, *Right to Know* with Dmitrii Kulikov, *Politics* with Petr Tolstoi and Alexander Gordon, *Special Correspondent* with Evgenii Popov, *News.doc* with Olga Skabeeva, *Duel* with Vladimir Soloviev) all make sure that the following groups get as much airtime as possible:

1. Russian liberals
2. Russian-speaking American journalists
3. Russian-speaking Polish officials and journalists
4. Ukrainian nationalists

These four groups are literally the “bread and butter” of these talk shows where they provide a constant stream of very entertaining political debates. Why? Because they utter the exact same nonsense which they are used to proclaiming in their own countries and if the western audience does not really know what to make of this propaganda, it sounds so outlandish to the Russian audience that these guests always get completely eviscerated (verbally, of course) by the Russian guests invited to the same talk show.

And just to make sure that every person in Russia ‘gets the message’, the main weekly news shows (*News of the Week* with Dmitri Kiselev, *Postscriptum* with Alexei Pushkov) always feature long excerpts from western propaganda reports and the most rabidly anti-Russian statements from western politicians.

For example, the BBC recently made a rather grotesque propaganda movie entitled “World War Three: Inside The War Room”

(<http://www.bbc.co.uk/mediacentre/proginfo/2016/05/inside-the-war-room>)

featuring Putin ordering the invasion of a Baltic state and a nuclear strike on a US aircraft carrier. The Russian media went crazy over this, and long excerpts of the show, with special effects and all,

were shown on Russian TV. The Russian public looked at this footage in awe and dismay at the stupidity of it all.

More recently, the US magazine posted a video about an upcoming issue of "Putin's Russia". Check out the video here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Sjvy-L7AWNA>

Needless to say, the Russians absolutely loved it. Not the image itself, of course, it was deeply offensive to them, but the fact that Foreign Affairs has so clearly shown its true face: hate-filled russophobia - Russia as a drunken, frustrated and wounded bear. They did wonder, however, why the westerners saw them as wounded; and wounded by what?

They also loved the “Making America Great Again” on top of the page which was obviously the propagandistic goal of this issue: to show Russia as wounded as a means to make “Merika” look “great again”.

Believe it or not, all this gives most Russians both a good healthy belly-laugh and an acute awareness of the hatred the West has for Russia. “They only love us when we are weak, wounded and drunk” is something which you can hear very often on Russian TV, and the blogosphere fully agrees.

Another regular feature on Russian TV which the general public cannot get enough of is Ukrainian nationalists. Not only do they systematically deny any problems in the Nazi-occupied Ukraine and continue to insist that the Russian military is operating in the Donbass, they even come “equipped” with the mandatory “chub”

(<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chupryna>) hairstyle and Ukie flag of the Ukronazi patriots.

It is quite an amazing experience to listen to the evening news with live reports and video footage of all the chaos and violence taking place in the Ukraine and then listen to these Urkonazi clowns explain that 2+2=3, that black is white and that water is dry.

I cannot think of a more effective way to totally ridicule the regime in Kiev.

Then there are our former east-European "brothers", especially the Poles. Their main source of pride is that they are now part of NATO and they openly say so. They actually admit that "we are afraid of Russia so we joined NATO" which makes them look both like idiots (nobody in Russia believes that Russia will invade anybody) and like cowards (from a Russian point of view, that kind of "hiding behind the bigger brother" elicits no respect at all). So if the Ukronazis come across as clowns, the Polish officials come across as cowards and prostitutes. And just to make sure that everybody gets it, the Russian media regularly reminds the Russian people that Poles are constantly making the ludicrous accusation that their government plane crash near Smolensk was somehow either shot down or bombed by Russia.

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2010\\_Polish\\_Air\\_Force\\_Tu-154\\_crash](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2010_Polish_Air_Force_Tu-154_crash))

Then there are the American journalists, mainly Michael Bohm (who speaks a pretty good Russian) and Mark Knuckles (whose Russian is hilariously horrible and who sounds like a bad movie's caricature of a CIA station chief during the Cold War). Oh boy, - these two provide for hours of excellent entertainment.

Michael Bohn is clearly the smarter of the two, but he is also by far the nastier. While he tries hard to avoid sounding like a typical US propagandists, he regularly "breaks down" and begins spewing some very obnoxious US imperialist nonsense. He also loves to try to deny any Russian success (all of which he dismisses as "propaganda"). Knuckles is just plain stupid and arrogant in a uniquely US way. Frankly, I am amazed that nobody in the USA has found a way to pull him away from the Russian TV before he further damages the image of the USA in Russia. Whatever may be the case, these guys are truly hilarious to watch, especially when

confronted with reasonable western journalists from France, Greece, Germany or even a fellow American (see a good example here: <http://thesaker.is/charles-bausmans-courageous-stance-against-a-us-propagandist/>).

Last but not least, there are the Russian liberals. You have to realize that by now the words “liberal” and “democrat” have become almost insults in Russia. Here is a typical Russian joke which illustrates the typical Russian view of liberals:

*A new teacher comes into the class:*

*– My name is Abram Davidovich, I’m a liberal. And now all stand up and introduce yourself like I did ...*

*– My name is Masha I liberal ...*

*– My name is Petia, I’m a liberal ...*

*– My name is Little Johnny, I’m a Stalinist.*

*– Little Johnny, why are you a Stalinist?!*

*– My mom is a Stalinist, my dad is a Stalinist, my friends are Stalinists and I too am a Stalinist.*

*– Little Johnny, - and if your mother was a whore, your father a drug addict, your friends – homos, what would you be then in that case? !*

*– Then I would be a liberal.*

Notice that the new teacher has a typically Jewish name, which illustrates the Russian belief that Jews are the prime proponents of the kind of “liberalism” folks like Berezovsky or Khodorkovsky incarnated in the 1990s. This is not some kind of anti-Semitism – this is simply a typical case of blowback.

So when the poor Russian liberals get to present their view on Russian TV, they not only are called to task to defend or, at least, try to justify AngloZionist imperial policies, they are also regularly reminded of the horror which Russia was under their rule in the 1990s. Just standing in the company of Russia-hating Americans,

Poles and Ukrainians they look discredited beyond any possible redemption.

There is really nothing as funny as watching Russian liberals, Americans, Poles and Ukrainians clamoring that there is no free speech in Russia on prime time Russian TV!

Keep in mind that the internal Russian media is very different from the English language Russia Today whose mission is to present an alternative point of view to a western audience and there are therefore very few rabid Russophobes invited to speak on RT. But inside Russia, the decision has clearly been made to expose the Russian general public to the exact same Russophobic propaganda as what the western public is subjected to.

In a way you could say that the Russian counter-propaganda technique is a form of intellectual inoculation: you give the body just enough exposure to the pathogen to trigger an immune response, but not so much as to infect and kill the body. As a result of this, the following associations have powerfully molded themselves into the Russian collective:

Russian liberals → the horror of the 1990s

American journalists → US imperial aggression

Polish officials and journalists → russophobia

Ukrainian nationalists → the horror of present day Banderastan

This is very, very effective. The best way to prove that is to remember that all these groups have the support of maybe 3-6% of the Russian population, max. A solid 95%+ is resolutely opposed to them and don't want them to have any say or even influence in the future of Russia.

As an ex-Cold War warrior myself, I remember well how ridiculous Soviet propaganda was and how nobody would take it seriously, not in the West and not in the East. Now the tables have turned and it is the western propaganda which is not taken



seriously anywhere (well, except maybe in Poland and the Baltic states) and which ends up damaging the credibility of the West.

The Empire's propaganda is simply counter-factual and totally illogical and it is quite obvious to a Russian audience. This is why the very last thing the Kremlin would ever want to do is to prevent the Russian people from being exposed to it.



# **In Syria, Russia Defends Civilization – the West Sides with Barbarism**

May 12, 2016

The recent Russian concert in Palmyra (<http://thesaker.is/praying-for-palmyra-russian-orchestra-performs-concert-honoring-victims-of-syria-war/>) was an event loaded with symbolism. While it was the Syrians who liberated this ancient city and while the Russians only provided support, this support was crucial and, besides, it was not just Palmyra which Russia saved, but the Syrian nation. I would even argue that the Russians in Palmyra saved not just Syria, but all of civilization.

Imagine you are an extraterrestrial watching our planet from space. Not only would you see the unspeakable atrocities committed by the Daesh liver-eating psychopaths, but you would see that the Empire which runs most of the planet, and the so-called "Western civilization", which shaped our modern world more than any other civilization, have given their full backing to the Daesh.

You would see the US TOW missiles used against the only army capable of standing up against Daesh; you would see all the countries making up the so-called "concert of nations" (about 1/3rd of the countries out there, maybe) calling for the overthrow of the legal and legitimate President of Syria even if that means that a black Daesh flag flies over Damascus.

You would see the genocide of Christians while the putatively Christian world looks away, and the genocide of (all non-Takfiri) Muslims while the putatively Muslim world looks away. You would see the self-described "Leader of the Free World" condemn the (very limited) Russian military intervention in Syria

and you would see a member of the most powerful military alliance on the planet (Turkey) make millions by trading stolen oil with Daesh.

This list could go on and on, but I think that we can agree that any extra-terrestrial observing this would be overcome by a total sense of disgust with the human race.

But then you would see one country – Russia – not only helping to liberate the ancient Palmyra from the demonic beasts which tried to destroy it but then also fully clear it of mines and unexploded ordinance, making it safe to rebuild. And, finally, you would see Russia bringing her best musicians to render a heartbreaking homage to those who were tortured and murdered not just by Daesh, but primarily by those who created and unleashed Daesh – the AngloZionist Empire.

I find it most significant that the concert did not begin with a piece by a Russian composer. Instead, the Russians chose to begin with a poignant piece by Johann Sebastian Bach: this famous “Chaconne”, Partita for solo violin N° 2 in D minor, BWV 1004.

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QqA3qQMKueA>)

Yehudi Menuhin called the Chaconne “*the greatest structure for solo violin that exists*” and Violinist Joshua Bell has said the Chaconne is “*not just one of the greatest pieces of music ever written, but one of the greatest achievements of any man in history. It’s a spiritually powerful piece, emotionally powerful, structurally perfect*”

(Source:

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Partita\\_for\\_Violin\\_No.\\_2\\_\(Bach\)#The\\_Ciaccona](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Partita_for_Violin_No._2_(Bach)#The_Ciaccona)).

This is no coincidence. The Russians chose mankind's greatest composer and one of his greatest compositions to show, I believe, that mankind is not only about evil, horror, lies and murder, and that the Western civilization also produced some of the most

refined, spiritual and beautiful art ever. Only the transcendent music of Bach could represent a worthy "voice" to bring beauty to the very same place where Daesh had organized mass executions. The message was "you want to destroy civilization and even beauty – and we bring you Bach!".

Bach as a "weapon of civilization" is no less important in this context than SU-34 aircraft and cruise missiles are to the "kinetic war" against terrorism.

It is ironic that Russia, which never was really part of the "Western World", was the one to bring Bach to Palmyra. Had the Americans decided to organize a concert, they would never have bothered with Palmyra or the Syrian people – they would have had Toby Keith ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Toby\\_Keith](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Toby_Keith)) sing "American Soldier"

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DWrMeBR8W-c>)  
for US Marines on a US military base (or something like <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5N1o8zQGmTI>).

The Russians, instead, played Bach in Palmyra.

Today Russia stands for all of civilization. Even the western one.



# Debunking popular clichés about modern warfare

May 19, 2016

## “What would a war between Russia and the USA look like?”

This must be the question which I am most frequently asked. This is also the question to which I hear the most outlandish and ill-informed responses. I have addressed this question in the past and those interested in this topic can consult the following articles:

- Remembering the important lessons of the Cold War  
<http://thesaker.is/remembering-the-important-lessons-of-the-cold-war/>
- Making sense of Obama’s billion dollar hammer  
<http://thesaker.is/making-sense-of-obamas-billion-dollar-hammer/>
- Why the US-Russian nuclear balance is as solid as ever  
<http://thesaker.is/why-the-us-russian-nuclear-balance-is-as-solid-as-ever/>
- Short reminder about US and Russian nuclear weapons  
<http://thesaker.is/short-reminder-about-us-and-russian-nuclear-weapons/>
- Thinking the unthinkable  
<http://thesaker.is/thinking-the-unthinkable/>
- The Russia-U.S. Conventional Military Balance  
<http://thesaker.is/the-russia-u-s-conventional-military-balance/>

It would be pointless for me to repeat it all here, so I will try to approach the issue from a somewhat different angle, but I would *strongly* recommend that those interested, take the time to read these articles which, while mostly written in 2014 and 2015, are still basically valid, especially in the methodology used to tackle this issue. All I propose to do today is to debunk a few popular clichés about modern warfare in general. My hope is that by debunking them I will provide you with some tools to cut through the nonsense which the corporate media loves to present to us as “analysis”.

### **Cliché No 1: The US military has a huge conventional advantage over Russia**

It all depends on what you mean by "advantage". The US armed forces are much larger than the Russian - that is true. But, unlike the Russians, they are spread all over the planet. *In warfare what matters is not the size of your military, but how much of it is actually available for combat in the **theater of military operations TMO** (conflict area).* For example, if in any one given TMO you have only 2 airfields each capable of sustaining air operations for, say 100 aircraft, it will do you no good to have 1000 aircraft available. You might have heard the sentence “*civilians focus on firepower, soldiers on logistics*“. This is true. Modern military forces are extremely “support heavy” meaning that for one tank, one aircraft or one artillery piece you need a huge and sophisticated support line making it possible for the tank, aircraft or artillery piece to operate in a normal way. Simply put – if your tank is out of fuel or spares – it stops. So it makes absolutely no sense to say, for example, that the USA has 13,000 aircraft and Russia only 3,000. This might well be true, but it is also irrelevant. What matters is only how many aircraft the US and NATO could

have ready to engage in the moment of the initiation of combat operations and what their mission would be. The Israelis have a long record of destroying the Arab air forces on the ground, rather than in the air, in surprise attacks which are the best way to negate a numerical advantage of an adversary. The reality is that the USA would need many months to assemble in Western Europe a force having even a marginal hope to take on the Russian military. And the reality also is that nothing could force the Russians to just sit and watch while such a force is being assembled (the biggest mistake Saddam Hussein made).

## **Cliché No 2: An attacker needs a 3:1 or even 4:1 advantage over the defender**

Well, this one is “kinda true”, especially on a tactical level. This is often used as a general rule of thumb. That being in the defense gives you a 3:1 advantage; meaning that if you have 1 battalion on the defense you would need 3 battalions on the offense in order to hope for a victory. But when looking at an operational or, even more so, strategic level, this rule is completely false. Why? Because the defending side has a huge disadvantage: it is always the attacker who gets to decide when to attack, where and how. For those interested in this topic I highly recommend the book “Surprise Attack: Lessons for Defense Planning” by Richard Betts (<http://www.amazon.com/Surprise-Attack-Lessons-Defense-Planning/dp/0815709293/>) which, while relatively old (1982) and very focused on the Cold War, provides a very interesting and thorough discussion of the advantages and risks of a surprise attack. This is a fascinating topic which I cannot discuss in detail here, but let's just say that a successfully pulled off surprise attack almost totally negates the advantage in theoretical forces ratios for the defender. Let me give you a simple example: imagine a front

line of 50 km in which each 5 km are defended on both sides by one division. So each side has 10 divisions, each responsible for the defense of 5km of the front, right? According to the 3:1 rule, side A needs 30 divisions to overcome the 10 divisions in the defense? Right? Wrong! What side A can do is concentrate 5 of its divisions on a 10km wide front and put the other five in the defense. On that 10km wide front, the attack side now has 5 attacking divisions against 2 defending ones while on the rest of the front, side A has 5 defending divisions against 8 (potentially) attacking ones. Notice that now side B does not have a 3:1 advantage to overcome side A's defenses (the actual ratio is now 8:5). In reality, what B will do is rush more divisions to defend the narrow 10km sector but that, in turn, means that B now has fewer divisions to defend the full front. From here on you can make many assumptions: side B can counter-attack instead of defending; side B can defend in depth (in several "echelons"; 2 or even 3); side A could also begin by faking attack on one sector of the front and then attack elsewhere; or side A can send, say, one reinforced battalion to move really fast and create chaos deep in the defenses of B. My point here is simply that this 3:1 rule is purely a tactical rule of thumb and that in real warfare theoretical forces ratios (norms) require much more advanced calculations, including the consequences of a surprise attack.

### **Cliché No 3: High technology wins the day**

That is a fantastically false statement and yet this myth is sacred dogma amongst civilians, especially in the USA. In the real world, high tech weapons systems, while very valuable, also come with a long list of problems; the first one of which is simply cost.



[Sidebar: when I was studying military strategy in the late 1990s one of our teachers (from the US Air Force) presented us with a graph showing the increasing cost of a single US fighter aircraft from the 1950s to the 1990s. He then projected this trend in the future and jokingly concluded that by roughly 2020 (IIRC) the USA would only have the money to afford one single and very, very expensive fighter. This was a joke, of course, but it had a very serious lesson in it: runaway costs can result in insanely expensive weapon systems which can only produce very few copies and which are very risky to engage].

Technology is also typically fragile and requires a very complex support, maintenance, and repair network. It makes no sense to have the best tank on the planet if it spends most of its time in major repairs.

Furthermore, one of the problems of sophisticated high tech gear is that its complexity makes it possible to attack it in many different ways. Take, for example, an armed drone. It can be defeated by:

1. shooting it out of the sky (active defense)
2. blinding or otherwise disabling its sensors (active defense)
3. jamming its communications with the operator (active defense)
4. jamming or disabling its navigation system (active defense)
5. camouflage/deception (passive defense)
6. providing it with false targets (passive defense)
7. protecting targets by, for example, burying them (passive defense)

8. remaining mobile and/or decentralized and/or redundant (passive defense)

There are many more possible measures; it all depends on the actual threat. The key here is, again, cost and practicality: how much does it cost to develop, build and deploy an advanced weapon system versus the cost of one (or several) counter-measures.

Finally, history has shown over and over again that willpower is far more important than technology. Just look at the absolutely humiliating and total defeat of the multi-billion high-tech Israeli Defense Forces by Hezbollah in 2006. The Israelis used their entire air force, a good part of their navy, their very large artillery, their newest tanks and they were defeated, horribly defeated, by probably about less than 2000 Hezbollah fighters and even those were not the very best Hezbollah had (Hezbollah kept the best ones north of the Litani River). Likewise, the NATO air campaign against the Serbian Army Corps in Kosovo will go down in history as one of the worst defeats of a huge military alliance backed by high-tech weapons by a small country equipped with clearly dated weapon systems.

[Sidebar: in both these wars what really "saved the day" for the AngloZionists was a truly world-class propaganda machine which successfully concealed the magnitude of the defeat of the AngloZionist forces. But the information is out there, and you can look it up for yourself].

## Cliché No 4: Big military budgets win the day

That is also a myth which is especially cherished in the USA. How often have you heard something like "the billion dollar B-2" or the "6 billion dollar Nimitz-class aircraft carrier"? The assumption here is that if the B-2 or the Nimitz costs so much money they must be truly formidable. But are they?

Take the **three hundred million dollar plus F-22A "Raptor"** and then look up the "deployment" subsection in the Wikipedia article about the F-22A.

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lockheed\\_Martin\\_F-22\\_Raptor#Deployments](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lockheed_Martin_F-22_Raptor#Deployments))

What have we got? A few Russian T-95s (date of introduction: 1956) bomber intercepts and one Iranian F-4 Phantom (date of introduction: 1960) interception. That, a few bombing runs in Syria and a motley assortment of overseas deployments for PR reasons. That's it! On paper the F-22A is an awesome aircraft and, in many ways it really is, but the real life reality is that the F-22A was only used on missions which an F-16, F-15 or F-18 could have done for cheaper and even done it better (the F-22A is a crappy bomber, if only because it was never designed to be one).

I already hear the counter-argument: the F-22A was designed for a war against the USSR and had that war happened it would have performed superbly. Yeah, maybe, except that less than 200 were ever built. Except that in order to maintain a low radar cross section the F-22 has a tiny weapons bay. Except that the Soviets deployed infra-red search and track systems on all their MiG-29s (a very non-high-tech fighter) and their SU-27s. Except that the Soviets had already begun developing "anti-stealth" radars and that nowadays the F-22A is basically useless against modern Russian radars. None of that negates that in terms of technology, the F-22A is a superb achievement and a very impressive air superiority

fighter; but one which would not have made a significant difference in a real war between the USA and the Soviet Union.

### **Cliché No 5: Big military alliances help win wars**

One more myth about wars which is cherished in the West: alliances win wars. The typical example is, of course, WWII: in theory, Germany, Italy, and Japan formed the "Axis powers" ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Axis\\_powers](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Axis_powers)) while 24 nations (including Mongolia and Mexico) formed the "Allies" ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Allies\\_of\\_World\\_War\\_II](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Allies_of_World_War_II)).

As we all know, the Allies defeated the Axis. That is utter nonsense. The reality is very different. Hitler's forces included about 2 million Europeans from 15 different countries which added 59 divisions, 23 brigades, a number of separate regiments, battalions and legions to the German forces. (Source:)

(<http://www.yaplakal.com/forum7/topic1081442.html>),

(<http://www.volk59.narod.ru/Euroforces.htm>),

(<http://territa.ru/load/1-1-0-8330>)

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European\\_non-](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_non-Germans_in_the_German_armed_forces_during_World_War_II)

[Germans\\_in\\_the\\_German\\_armed\\_forces\\_during\\_World\\_War\\_II](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_non-Germans_in_the_German_armed_forces_during_World_War_II))

Furthermore, the Red Army accounted for no less than 80% of all the German losses (in manpower and equipment) during the war. All the others, including the USA and the UK, shared the puny 20% or less and joined the war when Hitler was already clearly defeated. Some will mention the various resistance movements which did resist the Nazis, often heroically. I don't deny their valor and contribution, but it is important to realize that no resistance movement in Europe ever defeated a single German Wehrmacht or SS division (10 to 15 thousand men). In comparison, in Stalingrad alone the Germans lost 400,000 soldiers, the Romanians 200,000,

the Italians 130,000, and the Hungarians 120,000 for a total loss of 850,000 soldiers. In the Kursk battle, the Soviets defeated 50 German divisions counting about 900,000 soldiers.

[Sidebar: While resistance movements were typically engaged in sabotage, diversion or attacks on high-value targets, they were never designed to attack regular military formations, not even a company (120 men or so). The German forces in the USSR were structured into several "Army Groups" (*Heeresgruppe*) each of which contained 4-5 Armies (each with about 150,000 soldiers). What I am trying to illustrate with these figures is that the magnitude of the combat operations on the Eastern Front was not only different from what any resistance movement can deal with but also different from any other theater of military operations during WWII, at least for land warfare – the naval war in the Pacific was also fought on a huge scale].

The historical record is that one unified military force under one command usually performs much better than large alliances. Or, to put it differently, when large alliances do form, there is typically the “one big guy” who really matters and everybody else is more or less a sideshow (of course, the individual combatant who gets attacked, maimed and killed does not feel that he is a “sideshow”, but that does not change the big picture).

Speaking of NATO the reality is that ***there is no NATO outside the USA***. The USA is the only country in NATO which really matters. Not just in terms of numbers and firepower, but also in terms of intelligence, force projection, mobility, logistics, etc. Every single US commander knows and understands that perfectly, and while he will be impeccably courteous to his non-US

colleagues in Mons or during cocktail parties in Brussels, if the proverbial bovine excreta hits the fan and somebody has to go and fight the Russians, the Americans will count solely on themselves and will be happy if the rest of the NATO members get out of the way without delay.

### **Cliché No 6: Forward deployment gives a major advantage**

Day after day we hear the Russians complaining that NATO has moved to their borders; that thousands of US troops are now deployed in the Baltics or Poland; that the US has deployed anti-ballistic missiles in Romania; and that USN ships are constantly hugging the Russian coast in the Black and Baltic Sea. And it's all true and very deplorable. But where the Russians are being a tad disingenuous is when they try to present all this as a military threat to Russia.

The truth is that from a purely military point of view, deploying US forces in the Baltic states or sending USN ships into the Black Sea are very bad ideas; in the first case because the three Baltic states are indefensible anyway; and in the second case because the Black Sea is, for all practical purposes, a Russian lake where the Russian military can detect and destroy any ship within 30 minutes or less. The Americans are quite aware of that and if they decided to strike at Russia they would not do it from forward deployed ships but with long-range standoff weapons such as ballistic or cruise missiles.

[Sidebar: The notion that Russia would ever want to attack any of the Baltic States or sink a USN ship is ridiculous and I am in no way suggesting that this might happen. But when looking at purely military issues you look at capabilities, not intentions.]

The range of modern weapons is such that in case of war in Europe there will probably not be a real "front" or "rear", but being closer to the enemy still makes you easier to detect and exposes you to a wider array of possible weapons. Simply put, the closer you are to Russian firepower, electronic warfare systems, reconnaissance networks and personnel, the greater number of potential threats you need to worry about.

I would not go as far as to say that forward deployment does not give you any advantage; it does: your weapon systems can reach further, the flight time of your missiles (ballistic and cruise) is shorter, your aircraft need less fuel to get to their mission area, etc. But these advantages come at a very real cost. Currently forward deployed US forces are, at best, a trip-wire force whose aim is political: to try to demonstrate commitment. But they are not any real threat to Russia.

### **Cliché No 7: The US and NATO are protecting East European countries**

On paper and in the official NATO propaganda, all of Europe and the USA are ready, if needed, to start WWII to defend Estonia from the revanchist Russian hordes. Judging by how the tiny Baltic States and Poland constantly "bark" at Russia and engage in an apparently never-ending stream of infantile but nonetheless arrogant provocations, folks in Eastern Europe apparently believe that. They think that they are part of NATO, part of the EU, part of the "civilized West" and that their AngloZionist patrons will protect them from these scary Russkies. That belief just shows how stupid they are.

I wrote above that the USA is the only real military force in NATO and that US military and political leaders all know

that. And they are right. Non-US NATO capabilities are a joke. What in the world do you think the, say, Belgian or Polish armed forces are in reality. That's right – both a joke and a target. How about the glorious and invincible Portuguese and Slovenians? Same deal. The reality is that non-US NATO armed forces are just fig leaves hiding the fact that Europe is a US colony – some fig leaves are bigger, others are smaller. But even the biggest fig leaves (Germany and France) are still only that – a disposable utensil at the service of the real masters of the Empire. Should a real war ever break out in Europe, all these pompous little European statelets will be told to get the fuck out of the way and let the big boys take care of business. Both the Americans and the Russians know that, but for political reasons, they will never admit this publicly.

Here I have to admit that I cannot prove that. All I can do is offer a personal testimony. While I was working on my Master's Degree in Strategic Studies in Washington DC, I had the opportunity to meet and spend time with a lot of US military personnel ranging from Armored Cavalry officers deployed in the Fulda Gap to a Chief of Naval Operations. The first thing that I will say about them is that they were all patriots and, I think, excellent officers. They were all very capable of distinguishing political nonsense (like the notion of forward deploying US carriers to strike at the Kola Peninsula) from how the US would really fight. One senior Pentagon officer attached to the Office of Net Assessment was very blunt about that and declared to our classroom “no US President will ever sacrifice Chicago to protect Munich”. In other words, yes, the US would fight the Soviets to protect Europe, but the US will never escalate that fight to the point where US territory would be threatened by Soviet nukes.

The obvious flaw here is that this assumes that escalation can be planned and controlled. Well, escalation is being planned in



numerous offices, agencies, and departments, but all these models usually show that it is very hard to control. As for de-escalation, I don't know of any good models describing it (but my personal exposure to that kind of thing is now very old; maybe things have changed since the late 1990s?). Keep in mind that both the USA and Russia have the use of nuclear weapons to prevent a defeat in conventional warfare included in their military doctrines. So if we believe, as I do, that the US is not willing to go nuclear to, say, save Poland then this basically means that the US is not even willing to defend Poland by conventional means or, at least, not defend it very much.

Again, the notion that Russia would attack anybody in Europe is beyond ridiculous; no Russian leader would ever even contemplate such a stupid, useless, counter-productive and self-defeating plan, if only because Russia has no need for any territory. If Putin told Poroshenko that he did not want to take over the Donbass

(<http://www.themoscowtimes.com/news/news/article/putin-refused-poroshenkos-offer-to-take-donbass--forbes/518658.html>), how likely is that that the Russians are dreaming of occupying Lithuania or Romania?! I challenge anybody to come up with any rational reason for the Russians to want to attack any country in the West (or elsewhere, for that matter) even if that country had no military and was not a member of any military alliance. In fact, Russia could have \*easily\* invaded Georgia in the 08/08/08 war but did not. And when was the last time you heard Mongolia or Kazakhstan fearing a Russian (or Chinese) invasion?

So the simple truth is that for all the big gesticulations and vociferous claims about defending the Europeans against the “Russian threat” there is no Russian threat just like the USA will never deliberately initiate a nuclear slugfest with Russia to defend Chisinau or even Stockholm.

## Conclusion

So if all of the above are just clichés with no bearing on reality, why is the western corporate media so full of this nonsense? Mainly for two reasons: journalists are mostly "Jack of all trades, master of none" and they much prefer to pass on pre-packaged propaganda than to make the effort to try to understand something. As for the talking heads on TV, the various generals who speak as "experts" for CNN and the rest are also simply propagandists. The real pros are busy working for the various government agencies and they don't go on live TV to speak about the "Russian threat". But the most important reason for this nonsensical propaganda is that by constantly pretending to discuss a military issue, the AngloZionist propagandists are thereby hiding the real nature of the very real conflict between Russia and the USA over Europe: a political struggle for the future of Europe. If Russia has no intention of invading anybody, she sure does have huge interest in trying to decouple Europe from its current status of US colony/protectorate. The Russians fully realize that while the current European elites are maniacally Russophobic, most Europeans (with the possible exception of the Baltic States and Poland) are not. In that sense, the recent Eurovision vote where the popular vote was overturned by so-called "experts" is very symbolic.

The first Secretary General of NATO did very openly spell out its real purpose

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/NATO#cite\\_ref-FOOTNOTEReynolds199413\\_13-0](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/NATO#cite_ref-FOOTNOTEReynolds199413_13-0))

*“to keep the Russians out, the Americans in, and the Germans down.”* The Russians want it exactly the other way around: the Russians in (economically, not militarily, of course), the Americans out and the Germans up (again, economically). ***That is the real***

***reason behind all the tensions in Europe: the USA desperately wants a Cold War v.2 while Russia is trying as hard as she can to prevent this.***

So, what would a war between Russia and the USA look like? To be honest, I don't know. It all depends on so many different factors that it is pretty much impossible to predict. That does not mean that it cannot, or will not, happen. There are numerous very bad signs that the Empire is acting in an irresponsible way. One of the worst ones is that the NATO-Russia Council (NRC)

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/NATO-Russia\\_relations#NATO.E2.80.93Russia\\_Council](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/NATO-Russia_relations#NATO.E2.80.93Russia_Council)) has almost completely ceased to function.

The main reason for the creation of the NRC was to make sure that secure lines of communication were open, especially in a crisis or tension situation. Alas, as a way to signal their displeasure with Russia over the Ukraine, NATO has now almost completely closed down the NRC even though the NRC was created precisely for that purpose.

Furthermore, forward deploying, besides often being militarily useless, is also potentially dangerous as a local incident between the two sides can rapidly escalate into something very serious; especially when important lines of communication have been done away with. The good news, relatively speaking, is that the US and Russia still have emergency communications between the Kremlin and the White House and that the Russian and US armed forces also have direct emergency communication capabilities. But at the end of the day, the problem is not a technological one, but a psychological one: the Americans are apparently simply unable or unwilling to negotiate about anything at all. Somehow, the Neocons have imposed their worldview on the US deep state, and that worldview is that any dynamic between Russia and the USA is

a zero-sum one; that there is nothing to negotiate and that forcing Russia to comply and submit to the Empire by means of isolation and containment is the only thinkable approach. This will, of course, not work. The question is whether the Neocons have the intellectual capability to understand that; or, alternatively, whether the "old" (paleo-conservative) Anglo-US Patriots can finally kick the "crazies in the basement" (as Bush senior used to refer to the Neocons

(<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article11811.htm>)) out of the White House.

But if Hillary makes it into the White House in November, then things will become really scary. Remember how I said that no US President would ever sacrifice a US city in defense of a European one? Well, that assumes a patriotic President, one who loves his country. I don't believe that the Neocons give a damn about America or the American people, and these crazies might well think that sacrificing one (or many) US cities is well worth the price if that allows them to nuke Moscow.

Any theory of deterrence assumes a "rational actor", not a psychopathic and hate-filled cabal of "crazies in a basement".

During the last years of the Cold War, I was much more afraid of the gerontocrats in the Kremlin than of the Anglo officers and officials in the White House or the Pentagon. Now I fear the (relatively) new generation of "ass-kissing little chickenshits"

([http://www.correntewire.com/centcom\\_chief\\_admiral\\_fallon\\_petraeus\\_an\\_ass\\_kissing\\_little\\_chickenshit](http://www.correntewire.com/centcom_chief_admiral_fallon_petraeus_an_ass_kissing_little_chickenshit)) officers à la Petraeus, or maniacs like General Breedlove

(<http://sputniknews.com/military/20160225/1035347156/breedlove-nato-deterrence-russia.html>), which have replaced the "old style" Cold Warriors (like Admirals Elmo Zumwalt, William Crowe or Mike Mullen) who at least knew that a war with Russia must be avoided at all cost. It is outright frightening for me to realize that

the Empire is now run by unprofessional, incompetent, unpatriotic and dishonorable men who are either driven by hateful ideologies or whose sole aim in life is to please their political bosses.

The example of Ehud Olmert, Amir Peretz and Dan Halutz going to war against Hezbollah in 2006 or Saakashvili's attempt at ethnically cleansing South Ossetia in 2008 have shown the world that ideology-driven leaders can start absolutely unwinnable wars, *especially if they believe their own propaganda about their invincibility*. Let's hope and pray that this kind of insanity does not take over the current US leaders. The best thing that could happen for the future of mankind would be if real patriots would come back to power in the United States. Then mankind could finally breathe a big sigh of relief.



# How Russia is preparing for WWIII

May 26, 2016

I recently posted a piece in which I tried to debunk a few popular myths about modern warfare:

(<http://thesaker.is/debunking-popular-cliches-about-modern-warfare/>)

Judging by the many comments which I received in response to this post, I have to say that the myths in question are still alive and well and that I clearly failed to convince many readers. What I propose to do today is to look at what Russia is really doing in response to the growing threat from the West. But first, I have to set the context or, more accurately, re-set the context in which Russia is operating. Let's begin by looking at the AngloZionist policies towards Russia.

## **The West's actions:**

First on this list is, obviously, the conquest by NATO of all of Eastern Europe. I speak of conquest because that is exactly what it is, but a conquest achieved according to the rules of 21<sup>st</sup>-century warfare which I define as "80% informational, 15% economic and 5% military". Yes, I know, the good folks of Eastern Europe were just dreaming of being subjugated by the US/NATO/EU/etc. – but so what? Anyone who has read Sun Tzu will immediately recognize that this deep desire to be 'incorporated' into the AngloZionist "Borg" is nothing else but the result of a crushed self-identity, a deep-seated inferiority complex and, thus, a surrender which did not even have to be induced by military means. At the end of the day, it makes no difference what the locals thought they were achieving – they are now subjects of the Empire and their countries

more or less irrelevant colonies on the fringe of the AngloZionist Empire. As always, the local *comprador* elite is now bubbling with pride at being, or so they think, accepted as equals by their new masters (think Poroshenko, Tusk or Grybauskaite) which gives them the courage to bark at Moscow from behind the NATO fence. Good for them.

Second is the now total colonization of Western Europe into the Empire. While NATO moved to the East, the US also took much deeper control of Western Europe which is now administered for the Empire by what the former Mayor of London once called the “great supine protoplasmic invertebrate jellies” (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LI5oRTL-6rA>) – faceless bureaucrats à la François Hollande or Angela Merkel.

Third, the Empire has given its total support to semi-demonic creatures ranging from al-Khattab to Nadezhda Savchenko. The West’s policy is crystal clear and simple to the extreme: if it is anti-Russian we back it. This policy is best exemplified with a Putin and Russia demonization campaign which is, in my opinion, far worse and much more hysterical than anything during the Cold War.

Fourth, the West has made a number of highly disturbing military moves including the deployment of the first elements of an anti-missile system in Eastern Europe, the dispatching of various forms of rapid reaction forces, the deployment of a few armored units, etc. NATO now has forward deployed command posts which can be used to support the engagement of a rapid reaction force.

What does all this add up to?

Right now, nothing much, really. Yes, the NATO move right up to the Russian borders is highly provocative, but primarily in political terms. In purely military terms, not only is this a very bad idea (see cliché #6 here: <http://thesaker.is/debunking-popular-cliches-about-modern-warfare/>), but the size of the actual forces

deployed is, in reality, tiny: the ABM system currently deployed can, at best, hope to intercept a few missiles (10-20 depending on your assumptions) as for the conventional forces they are of the battalion size (more or less 600 soldiers plus support). So right now there is categorically no real military threat to Russia.

So why are the Russians so clearly upset?

Because the current US/NATO moves might well be just the first steps of a much larger effort which, given enough time, might begin presenting a very real danger for Russia.

Furthermore, the kind of rhetoric coming out of the West now is not only militaristic and Russophobic, it is often outright messianic. The last time around the West had a flare up of its 1000-year-old chronic "messianic syndrome" condition, Russia lost 20 (to 30) million people. So the Russians can be forgiven if they are paying a great deal of attention to what the AngloZionist propaganda actually says about them.

The Russians are most dismayed at the re-colonization of Western Europe. Long gone are the days when people like Charles de Gaulle, Helmut Schmidt or François Mitterrand, were in charge of Europe's future. For all their very real faults, these men were at least real patriots and not just US colonial administrators. The 'loss' of Western Europe is far more concerning for the Russians than the fact that ex-Soviet colonies in Eastern Europe are now under US colonial administration. Why?

Look at this from the Russian point of view.

The Russians all see that the US power is on the decline and that the dollar will, sooner or later, gradually or suddenly, lose its role as the main reserve and exchange currency on the planet (this process has already begun). Simply put – unless the US finds a way to dramatically change the current international dynamic, the AngloZionist Empire will collapse. The Russians believe that what the Americans are doing is, at best, to use tensions with Russia to



revive a dormant Cold War v2 and, at worst, to actually start a real shooting war in Europe.

So a declining Empire with a vital need for a major crisis, a spineless Western Europe unable to stand up for its own interest, a subservient Eastern Europe just begging to turn into a massive battlefield between East and West, and a messianic, rabidly Russophobic rhetoric as the background for an increase in military deployments on the Russian border. Is anybody really surprised that the Russians are taking all this very, very seriously even if right now the military threat is basically non-existent?

## **The Russian reaction**

So let us now examine the Russian reaction to Empire's stance.

First, the Russians want to make darn sure that the Americans do not give in to the illusion that a full-scale war in Europe would be like WWII which saw the US homeland only suffer a few, tiny, almost symbolic, attacks by the enemy. Since a full-scale war in Europe would threaten the very existence of the Russian state and nation, the Russians are now taking measures to make darn sure that, should that happen, the US would pay an immense price for such an attack.

Second, the Russians are now evidently assuming that a conventional threat from the West might materialize in the foreseeable future. They are therefore taking the measures needed to counter that conventional threat.

Third, since the USA appears to be dead set into deploying an anti-ballistic missile system not only in Europe but also in the Far East, the Russians are taking the measures to both defeat and bypass this system.

The Russian effort is a vast and a complex one, and it covers almost every aspect of Russian force planning, but there are four

examples which, I think, best illustrate the Russian determination not to allow a 22 June 1941 to happen again:

- The re-creation of the First Guards Tank Army (in progress)
- The deployment of the Iskander-M operational-tactical missile system (done)
- The deployment of the Sarmat ICBM (in progress)
- The deployment of the Status-6 strategic torpedo (in progress)

## **The re-creation of the First Guards Tank Army**

It is hard to believe, but the fact is that between 1991 and 2016 Russia did not have a single large formation (division size and bigger) in its Western Military District; only a few brigades, regiments and battalions which nominally were called an “Army”. To put it simply – Russia clearly did not believe that there was a conventional military threat from the West and therefore she did not even bother deploying any kind of meaningful military force to defend from such a non-existent threat. By the way, that fact should also tell you everything you need to know about Russian plans to invade the Ukraine, Poland or the Baltics: this is utter nonsense. This has now dramatically changed.

Russia has officially announced that the First Guards Tank Army (1TGA) (a formation with a prestigious and very symbolic history

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1st\\_Guards\\_Tank\\_Army\\_\(Soviet\\_Union\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1st_Guards_Tank_Army_(Soviet_Union)))).

will now include the 4th “*Kantemirov*” Guards Tank Division, the 2nd “*Taman*” Guards Motorized Rifle Division, the 6th Tank Brigade, the 27th Guards Motor Rifle Brigade Sevastopol and many support units. This Army’s HQ will be located in the Odinstovo

suburb of Moscow. Currently, the Army is equipped with T-72B3 and T-80 main battle tanks, but they will be replaced by the brand new and revolutionary T-14 Armata tank

(<http://taskandpurpose.com/why-russias-new-tanks-are-a-wake-up-call-for-the-us/>) while the current infantry fighting vehicles (IFVs) and armored personnel carriers (APCs) will be replaced by the new Bumerang APC

(<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bumerang>)

and the Kurganets-25 IFV

(<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kurganets-25>).

In the air, these armored units will be protected and supported by Mi-28 and Ka-52 attack helicopters. Make no mistake, this will be a very large force, exactly the kind of force needed to smash through an attacking enemy force (by the way, the 1TGA was present at the Kursk battle). I am pretty sure that by the time the 1TGA is fully organized it will become the most powerful armored formation anywhere between the Atlantic and the Urals (especially in qualitative terms). If the current tensions continue or even worsen, the Russians could even augment the 1TGA to a type of 21<sup>st</sup> century "Shock Army" with increased mobility specializing in breaking deep into the enemy's defenses.

## **The deployment of the Iskander-M operational-tactical missile system**

The new Iskander-M operational-tactical missile system is a formidable weapon by any standard. While technically it is a short-range tactical missile (under 1000km range, the Iskander-M has an official range of 500km), it can also fire the R-500 missile which has the capability of striking at an intermediate/operational range (over 1000km) (The R-500 has a range of 2000km). It is extremely

accurate, it has advanced anti-ABM capabilities, it flies at hypersonic speeds and is practically undetectable on the ground (see [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/9K720\\_Iskander](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/9K720_Iskander) for more details).

This will be the missile tasked with destroying all the units and equipment the US and NATO have forward-deployed in Eastern Europe and, if needed, clear the way for the 1TGA.

## **The deployment of the Sarmat ICBM**

Neither the 1TGA nor the Iskander-M missile will threaten the US homeland in any way. Russia thus needed some kind of weapon which would truly strike fear into the Pentagon and White House in the way the famous RS-36 Voevoda (aka SS-18 “Satan” in US classification) did during the Cold War. The SS-18, the most powerful ICBM ever developed, was scary enough. The RS-28 “Sarmat” (SS-X-30 by NATO classification ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RS-28\\_Sarmat](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RS-28_Sarmat))) brings the terror to a totally new level.

The Sarmat is nothing short of amazing. It will be capable of carrying 10-15 MIRVed ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multiple\\_independently\\_targetable\\_reentry\\_vehicle](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Multiple_independently_targetable_reentry_vehicle)) warheads which will be delivered in a so-called “depressed” (suborbital) trajectory and which will remain maneuverable at hypersonic speeds. The missile will not have to use the typical trajectory over the North Pole but will be capable of reaching any target anywhere on the planet from any trajectory. All these elements combined will make the Sarmat itself and its warheads completely impossible to intercept.

The Sarmat will also be capable of delivering conventional Iu-71 hypersonic warheads capable of a “kinetic strike” which could

be used to strike a fortified enemy target in a non-nuclear conflict. This will be made possible by the amazing accuracy of the Sarmat's warheads which, courtesy of a recent Russian leak, we now know have a *circular error probable (CEP)*(a measure of a weapon system's precision) of 10 meters

The Sarmat's silos will be protected by unique "active protection measures" which will include 100 guns capable of firing a "metallic cloud" of forty thousand 30mm "bullets" to an altitude of up to 6km. The Russians are also planning to protect the Sarmat with their new S-500 air defense systems. Finally, the Sarmat's preparation to start time will be under 60 seconds thanks to a highly automated launch system. What this all means is that the Sarmat missile will be invulnerable in its silo, during its flight and on re-entry in the lower parts of the atmosphere.

It is interesting to note that while the USA has made a great deal of noise around its planned Prompt Global Strike system ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prompt\\_Global\\_Strike](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prompt_Global_Strike)), the Russians have already begun deploying their own version of this concept.

## **The deployment of the Status-6 strategic torpedo**

Do you remember the carefully staged "leak" in November of last year when the Russians 'inadvertently' showed a super duper secret strategic torpedo on prime time news? (<http://thesaker.is/did-russia-just-gently-threaten-the-usa/>)

What is shown is an "autonomous underwater vehicle" which has advanced navigational capabilities but which can also be remote controlled and steered from a specialized command module. This vehicle can dive as deep as 1000m, at a speed up to 185km/h and it has a range of up to 10,000km. It is delivered by specially configured submarines.

The Status-6 system can be used to target aircraft carrier battle groups, US Navy bases (especially *SSBN (submarine, ballistic, nuclear)* bases) and; in its most frightening configuration, it can be used to deliver high-radioactivity cobalt bombs ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cobalt\\_bomb](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cobalt_bomb)) capable of laying waste to huge expanses of land. The Status-6 delivery system would be a new version of the T-15 torpedo which would be 24m long, 1,5m wide, weigh 40 tons and be capable of delivering a **100 megaton warhead** which would make it twice as powerful as the most powerful nuclear device ever detonated: the Soviet Czar-bomb (57 megatons). ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tsar\\_Bomba](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tsar_Bomba)). Hiroshima was only 15 kilotons.

Keep in mind that most of the USA's cities and industrial centers are all along the coastline which makes them extremely vulnerable to torpedo based attacks (be it Sakharov's proposed "Tsunami bomb" (<https://www.facebook.com/john.bengtson.9/posts/10202519228606552>) or the Status-6 system). And, just as in the case of the Iskander-M or the Sarmat ICBM, the depth and speed of the Status-6 torpedo would make it basically invulnerable to interception.

## **Evaluation:**

There is really nothing new in all of the above, and US military commanders have always known that. All the US anti-ballistic missile systems have always been primarily a financial scam, from Reagan's "Star Wars" to Obama's "anti-Iranian ABM". For one thing, any ABM system is susceptible to 'local saturation': if you have X number ABM missiles protecting a Y long space against an X number of missiles, all that you need to do is to saturate only one sector of the Y space with \*a lot\* of real and fake missiles by firing

them all together through one small sector of the Y space the ABM missile system is protecting. And there are plenty of other measures the Russians could take. They could put just one single Submarine Launched Ballistic Missile (SLBM) capable submarine in Lake Baikal making it basically invulnerable. There is already some discussion of that idea in Russia. Another very good option would be to re-activate the Soviet BzhRK rail-mobile ICBM ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RT-23\\_Molodets](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/RT-23_Molodets)). Good luck finding them in the immense Russian train network. In fact, the Russians have plenty of cheap and effective measures. Want me to list one more?

Sure!

Take the Kalibr cruise-missile

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/3M-54\\_Klub](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/3M-54_Klub)) recently seen in the war in Syria. Did you know that it can be shot from a typical commercial container, like the ones you find on trucks, trains or ships? Check out this excellent video which explains this:

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mbUU\\_9bOcnM](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mbUU_9bOcnM)

Just remember that the Kalibr has a range of anywhere between 50km to 4000km and that it can carry a nuclear warhead. How hard would it be for Russia to deploy these cruise missiles right off the US coast in regular container ships? Or just keep a few containers in Cuba or Venezuela? This is a system which is so undetectable that the Russians could deploy it off the coast of Australia to hit the NSA station in Alice Springs if they wanted, and nobody would even see it coming.

The reality is that the notion that the US could trigger a war against Russia (or China for that matter) and not suffer the consequences on the US mainland is absolutely ridiculous. And yet, when I hear all the crazy talk by western politicians and generals I get the impression that they are forgetting about this undeniable fact. Frankly, even the current threats against Russia

have a 'half-backed' feel to them: a battalion here, another one there, a few missiles here, a few more there. It is like the rulers of the Empire don't realize that it is a very, very bad idea to constantly poke a bear when all you are carrying with you is a pocket-knife. Sometimes the reaction of western politicians reminds me of the thugs who try to rob a gas station with a plastic or empty gun and who are absolutely stunned when they get gunned down by the owner or the cops. This kind of thuggery is nothing more than a form of "suicide by cop" which never ends well for the one trying to get away with it.

So sometimes things have to be said directly and unambiguously: Western politicians better not believe their own imperial hubris. So far, all their threats have achieved is that the Russians have responded with many but futile verbal protests and a **full-scale program to prepare Russia for WWII**.

As I have written many times, Russians are very afraid of war and they will go out of their way to avoid it. But they are also ready for war. This is a uniquely Russian cultural feature which the West has misread an innumerable number of times over the past 1000 years or so. Over and over again the Europeans attacked Russia only to find themselves in a fight they would never have imagined, even in their worst nightmares. This is why the Russians like to say that "Russia never starts wars, she only ends them".

There is a profound cultural chasm between how the West views warfare and how the Russians do. In the West, warfare is, really, "the continuation of politics by other means". For Russians, it is a ruthless struggle for survival. Just look at generals in the West: they are polished and well-mannered managers much more similar to corporate executives than to, say, Mafia bosses. Take a look at Russian generals (for example, watch the Victory Day parade in Moscow). In comparison to their western colleagues, they look almost brutish, because first and foremost they are



ruthless and calculating killers. I don't mean that in a negative way – they often are individually very honorable and even kind men, and like every good commander, they care for their men and love their country. But the business they are in is not the continuation of politics by other means, the business they are in is survival. At all costs.

You cannot judge a military or, for that matter, a nation, by how it behaves when it triumphs when it is on the offensive pursuing a defeated enemy. All armies look good when they are winning. You can really judge the nature of a military, or a nation, at its darkest hour, when things are horrible and the situation worse than catastrophic. That was the case in 1995 when the Yeltsin regime ordered a totally unprepared, demoralized, poorly trained, poorly fed, poorly equipped and completely disorganized Russian military (well, a few hastily assembled units) to take Grozny from the Chechens. It was hell on earth. Here is some footage of General Lev Rokhlin in a hastily organized command post in a basement inside Grozny. He is as exhausted, dirty and exposed as any of his soldiers. Just look at his face and look at the faces of the men around him. This is what the Russian army looks like when it is in the depth of hell, betrayed by the traitors sitting in the Kremlin and abandoned by most of the Russian people (who, I am sorry to remind here, mostly were only dreaming of McDonald's and Michael Jackson in 1995).

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4KpUIDu5tYk>

Can you imagine, say, General Wesley Clark or David Petraeus fighting like these men did?

Check out this video of General Shamanov reading the riot act to a local Chechen politician (no translation needed): [https://www.youtube.com/watch?time\\_continue=3&v=rZ8Xd9ZPoGI](https://www.youtube.com/watch?time_continue=3&v=rZ8Xd9ZPoGI)

Shamanov nowadays is the Commander in Chief of the Airborne Forces whose size Putin quietly doubled to 72,000, (<http://www.examiner.com/article/russia-to-double-size-of-airborne-forces-over-the-next-7-years>); something I mentioned in the past as highly relevant, especially in comparison with the rather tepid force level increases announced by NATO (see: EU suicide by reality denial” (<http://thesaker.is/the-eus-suicide-by-reality-denial/>)). To get a feel for what modern Russian airborne forces are like, check out this article (<http://thesaker.is/a-look-into-the-modern-russian-airborne-forces/>).

It is not my intention here to glorify nuclear war or the Russian Armed Forces. The reason for this article and many others is to try to raise the alarm about what I see is happening nowadays. Western leaders are drunk on their own imperial hubris, nations which in the past were considered as minor stains on a map now feel emboldened to constantly provoke a nuclear superpower. Americans are being lied to and promised that some magical high tech will protect them from war while the Russians are seriously gearing up for WWII because they have come to the conclusion that the only way to prevent that war is to make absolutely and unequivocally clear to the AngloZionists that they will never survive a war with Russia, even if every single Russian is killed. (<http://www.businessinsider.com/a-spherical-bunker-in-russia-was-the-most-secure-place-in-the-entire-cold-war-2015-3>)

I remember the Cold War well. I was part of it. And I remember that the vast majority of us, on both sides, realized that a war between Russia and the West must be avoided at all costs. Now I am horrified when I read articles by senior officials seriously discussing such a possibility.

Just read this article, please: What would a war between the EU and Russia look like

(<https://www.quora.com/What-would-a-war-between-the-EU-and-Russia-look-like/answer/Sorin-Adam-Matei-1>)? Here is what this guy writes:

*“To the poetically inclined, the Russian military looks more like a gigantic pirate crew, than a regular army. The ones who rule are the ones with the sharpest cutlass and biggest mouth, typically some scurvy infested mates who rely on the support of their mates to make any unpopular “officer” walk the plank... Or, more aptly, they resemble the members of the Cossack horde, run by the Brashier warriors... While these troops can be very brave, at times, they are not effective in the field against a well regulated and trained modern military machine. Given this, it is improbable, nay, impossible for ordinary Russian troops to conduct operations of major consequence at more than platoon level against any disciplined armies, especially the US, British, German, or French.”*

This kind of writing really scares me. Not because of the imbecilic and racist stupidity of it, but because it largely goes unchallenged in the mainstream media. Not only that, there are plenty such articles written elsewhere.

see here:

(<http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/not-so-scary-why-russias-military-paper-tiger-14136>),

here:

(<http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Articles/2014/04/30/Russia-s-Military-Bear-Paper-Tiger>)

or here:

(<http://imrussia.org/en/analysis/world/2389-russias-military-is-a-paper-tiger-in-the-baltic>).

Of course, the authors of that kind of "analyses" make their money precisely with the kind of manic cheer-leading for the Western forces, but that is exactly the mindset which got Napoleon and Hitler in trouble and which ended with Russian forces stationed in Paris and Berlin. Compare that kind of jingoistic and, frankly, irresponsible nonsense with what a real military commander, Montgomery, had to say on this topic:

*“The next war on land will be very different from the last one, in that we shall have to fight it in a different way. In reaching a decision on that matter, we must first be clear about certain rules of war. Rule 1, on page I of the book of war, is: “Do not march on Moscow”. Various people have tried it, Napoleon and Hitler, and it is no good. That is the first rule.”*

So who do you trust - professional cheerleaders or professional soldiers? Do you really believe that Obama (or Hillary), Merkel and Hollande will do better than Napoleon or Hitler?

If the AngloZionist 'deep state' is really delusional enough to trigger a war with Russia, in Europe or elsewhere, the narcissistic and hedonistic West, drunk on its own propaganda and hubris, will discover a level of violence and warfare it cannot even imagine and if that only affected those responsible for these reckless and suicidal policies it would be great. But the problem is, of course,

that many millions of us, simple, regular people, will suffer and die as a consequence of our collective failure to prevent that outcome. I hope and pray that my repeated warnings will at least contribute to what I hope is a growing realization that this folly has to be immediately stopped and that sanity must return to politics.



# Led by Poland, the European “House Negroes” Compete for the Darwin Awards

June 03, 2016

*“And now, when all of these benefits and all this aid has been lost and discarded, England, leading the France offers to guarantee the integrity of Poland — the same in Poland, which just six months ago, with greedy hyena appetite took part in the robbery and destruction of the Czechoslovak state.”*

*-Winston Churchill, The Gathering Storm*

We really live in a crazy world. In preparation for the next NATO summit in Warsaw, already announced as ‘landmark summit’

(<http://www.thenews.pl/1/6/Artykul/254000,Stoltenberg-expects'landmark'99-NATO-summit-in-Warsaw>), kids in Poland will be submitted to 4 hours of NATO propaganda a week for the next two months. Apparently, the Poles believe that their safety will be greatly enhanced if they succeed in creating the strongest possible tensions between NATO and Russia. Either that or they think that the Russians will be absolutely terrified; that they will return the Crimea to the Ukronazi junta in Kiev, abandon the Donbass and unilaterally demilitarize.

There is nothing new here. Poland – the country which Winston Churchill called a “greedy hyena” – has a long history of trying to attack Russia when Russia is at her weakest, and the greatest Polish “heroes” are famous for attacking Russia in the times of internal trouble. Except that this time around Russia is not weak and the Russian people are solidly behind the Kremlin.

You could say that the Russian bear is utterly unimpressed by the Polish hyena, especially when it hides behind the American eagle to bark at Russia.

The Polish view of history is nothing short of bizarre. For example, Polish politicians constantly blame the Soviet Union for the 1939 Soviet-German non-aggression treaty (aka “Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact”) of 1939 ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Molotov-Ribbentrop\\_Pact](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Molotov-Ribbentrop_Pact)). They conveniently “forget” that a full five years before 1939 Poland was the first to sign the 1934 Polish-German non-aggression treaty (for some reason not known as the “Piłsudski-Hitler Pact”) ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/German-Polish\\_Non-Aggression\\_Pact](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/German-Polish_Non-Aggression_Pact)). Speaking of Piłsudski, take a look at this (very politically correct) summary of his life and actions ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Józef\\_Piłsudski](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Józef_Piłsudski)) and you will see that having a megalomaniacal Fascist national hero is not only a Ukrainian feature.

Apparently, history taught the Poles absolutely nothing.

They are hardly alone.

Most of Eastern Europe seems to be seized by a militaristic frenzy and a genuine fear that the Russians are about to invade. Just enter “Baltic invasion drills” in your favorite search engine and see for yourself how the imperial propaganda machine is constantly discussing whether an (apparently imminent) Russian invasion can be stopped, or not, and how the US tanks will save the Baltics from the Russkies.

Russians, who are constantly informed about these developments which are discussed on an almost daily basis in the Russian media, are absolutely baffled by this paranoid hysteria. In fact, they have a hard time believing that anybody could take that kind of nonsense seriously.

At the same time, however, the Russians are also realizing that what is taking place now is very much like what preceded the

German invasion of the Soviet Union: a mix of rabidly Russophobic rhetoric and an increasing concentration of military forces along the eastern borders of the Soviet Union. So even though the notion of Poland or anyone else actually preparing for a Russian invasion elicits only baffled reactions and giggles in Russia, the Russians are also assuming that the current militarization is only the first step in a much longer and larger process and are actively preparing for war too.

What will happen next is hardly a surprise: the toxic mix of US Neocons and East-European Russophobes will result in first and foremost a lot of paranoid rhetoric and grandstanding and an increase of US and NATO forces in Eastern Europe. That, in turn, will result in the inevitable increase of Russian military capabilities directed at NATO, which will give the NATO officials even more reasons to speak of a "Russian threat" and give more paranoid nightmares to the East-Europeans.

There is no way to deny that this is a huge victory for the US Neocons: they have finally created a situation in which:

1. East-Europeans are so terrified that they are unable to think logically.
2. West Europeans may be capable of thinking, but cannot take any action.
3. All EU countries will increase their military spending and purchase; mostly US weapon systems (to meet NATO standards). The US MIC will make a killing.
4. NATO will find a new (old) role for itself.
5. Russia will be further decoupled from the EU, especially economically.
6. Europeans will be further terrified by predictions of war and further convinced that NATO is the indispensable alliance led by the indispensable nation.



7. Russia will be further surrounded by new US protectorates (Finland and Georgia are probably next)

If this is a huge success for the Empire; this is also a huge failure for Russia.

However, I don't think that anybody could have prevented this outcome. Let's be honest here: there is nobody for the Russians to speak to in Europe (except, maybe, Hungarian President Orbán). The Russians tried everything they possibly could to try to revive a modicum of common sense into the European politicians, but to no avail; the Europeans simply don't have the brains, the spine or the balls to dare to have an opinion of their own. Instead, their opinion is whatever the White House says.

I know, the argument will be that it's only the leaders; that the people of Europe don't support these policies. But how is it that millions of Europeans took to the streets during the so-called "Euromissile crisis" or to oppose the war in Iraq, but have absolutely nothing to say about their sovereignty being turned into a farce; about their leaders supporting a Nazi regime in Kiev and about being used by the USA as cannon fodder in a possible continental war?

I can only conclude that the Europeans deserve the leaders they have.

They also all deserve a collective Darwin Award ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Darwin\\_Awards](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Darwin_Awards)). Especially the East-Europeans who have painted a bull's-eye on their heads, just to please Uncle Sam. One Polish official denounced the "Negro mentality"

(<http://www.politico.eu/article/polish-foreign-minister-witold-waszczykowski-no-more-negro-mentality-toward-states-duda-obama/>) of his colleagues and one ex-foreign minister even spoke of "giving oral sex and getting nothing in return"

(<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2664969/Polish-minister-calls-US-ties-worthless.html>), a very apt image indeed. But these outbursts lead to nothing. If McCain compared Russia to a “gas station masquerading as a country” then I would compare EU as a brothel masquerading as a continental alliance, a brothel where Americans get serviced for free. “Despised by all, feared by none” could become the new EU motto.

At the NATO summit in Warsaw the Americans will try hard to treat their EU-NATO allies with absolute courtesy and respect, but in reality, they will view them exactly as what Malcolm X called the “house negro”.

(<http://ccnmtl.columbia.edu/projects/mmt/mxp/speeches/mxa17.html>).

Let me quote him in full as it is a perfect description of the modern European:

*“So you have two types of Negro; the old type and the new type. Most of you know the old type. When you read about him in history during slavery he was called “Uncle Tom.” He was the house Negro. And during slavery, you had two Negroes. You had the house Negro and the field Negro. The house Negro usually lived close to his master. He dressed like his master. He wore his master’s second-hand clothes. He ate food that his master left on the table. And he lived in his master’s house—probably in the basement or the attic—but he still lived in the master’s house. So whenever that house Negro identified himself, he always identified himself in the same sense that his master identified himself. When his master said, “We have good food,” the house Negro would say, “Yes, we have plenty of good food.” “We” have plenty of good food. When the master said that “we*

*have a fine home here,” the house Negro said, “Yes, we have a fine home here.” When the master would be sick, the house Negro identified himself so much with his master he’d say, “What’s the matter boss, we sick?” His master’s pain was his pain. And it hurt him more for his master to be sick than for him to be sick himself. When the house started burning down, that type of Negro would fight harder to put the master’s house out than the master himself would. But then you had another Negro out in the field. The house Negro was in the minority. The masses—the field Negroes were the masses. They were in the majority. When the master got sick, they prayed that he’d die. If his house caught on fire, they’d pray for a wind to come along and fan the breeze. If someone came to the house Negro and said, “Let’s go, let’s separate,” naturally that Uncle Tom would say, “Go where? What could I do without boss? Where would I live? How would I dress? Who would look out for me?” That’s the house Negro. But if you went to the field Negro and said, “Let’s go, let’s separate,” he wouldn’t even ask you where or how. He’d say, “Yes, let’s go.” And that one ended right there.”*

Is that not a perfect description of the "new European" towards the USA?

And I am quite certain that US officers will have far more respect for their Russian “adversaries” than for their NATO “allies” (I have often noted that attitude in US servicemen).

Still, I am not losing all hope.

First, I want to believe that the Neocons can still be defeated in the USA and that what I call the "old Anglo guard" can give them

the boot. Second, I have not lost hope in two European nations: France and Italy. I might be mistaken, but it seems to me that the French and the Italians are, in Europe, those who are least influenced by the imperial propaganda machine, maybe because of their complex and rich history, who knows? I think that there is a typically Latin (I mean that culturally, not religiously) spirit of resistance and revolt which has not been completely blotted out of the French and Italian people. I might be very naïve of course, and totally wrong. I had high hopes for the Greeks, but all they could muster was the resistance power of a wet firecracker. Even the always proud Serbs appear to have been put down on their knees, at least for the time being. It is a very sad spectacle indeed.

In the meantime, there are signs that Russia is coming out of the recession (<http://theduran.com/russia-exits-recession/>). The Russian armed forces are planning over 2000 military exercises just for 2016 (<http://abcnews.go.com/International/wireStory/russian-military-hold-2000-drills-2016-39523679>). As for the Russian people, they still overwhelmingly support Putin (<http://www.economist.com/blogs/graphicdetail/2016/02/daily-chart-4>).

After the upcoming NATO summit in Warsaw, this popularity is likely to soar even higher.



## **False flags fluttering in the Empire's hot air**

July 29, 2016

When I think of the recent developments in the USA (Dallas shooting, Orlando shooting) and Europe (Nice, murdered priest, Germany shooting) I get this unpleasant feeling that something is not quite right. For one thing, the perpetrators are absolutely ridiculous: pseudo-Muslims who turn out to be drinking homosexuals, ex-patients of mental institutions – the kind of people I call “overnight Muslims”: they all make darn sure to say Allahu Akbar a number of times, but other than that, they have no sign of Islam at all. In fact, far from being trained Daesh fighters, they are all losers with weak personalities. Exactly the kind of people the special services (and religious sects) like to prey on because they are weak and easy to manipulate. Oh yes, I know, the good folk at Daesh do end up claiming that the perpetrator is one of them, but that really proves nothing (except maybe that Daesh is desperate to increase its notoriety).

I have no proof of that, of course, but I am getting the very strong feeling that somebody is putting a great deal of effort to scare the bejesus out of the TV-watching crowd. But why? Why would anybody go to the effort to create a completely fictional threat?

And should we really dismiss all the innumerable witnesses who speak of “more than one shooter”? What about the absolutely ridiculous police “overkill” when hundreds of policemen are sent in to deal with one single shooter. Does that not strike you as odd? Am I the only one with the feeling that what is shown to us is a carefully choreographed show?

Then there is the canard about the Islamic threat. Okay, it is true that all these Islamo-terrorists told the cops, and anybody else

willing to listen, that they are killing infidels for the greater glory of God. That reminds me of the passports helpfully found in NY on 9/11 (and at the Charlie-Hebdo attacks) or how the alleged Islamo-terrorists of 9/11 left copies of the Quran in the bars where they were getting “lap dances”. The problem with all that nonsense is that there is exactly zero real evidence that any of these terrorists had any real Islamic education or beliefs. Besides, even if every single one of them turned out to be deeply religious and pious Muslims, that would hardly prove anything. The IRA was “Roman Catholic” and yet nobody spoke of a “Catholic threat”. True, there is a very real threat to the entire Middle-East from the Daesh crazies (yes, the very same ones whom the US wants the Russians to stop bombing), but there is no evidence whatsoever of any real subordination/coordination between the Takfiris in the Middle-East and the perpetrators of the recent mass murders in the USA and Europe.

The *cui bono*, of course, immediately points to those interests who desperately want to prop-up the shaky “Islamic threat” myth: the Zionists, of course, but also the Neocon elites in the USA and the EU.

Think of it: their great hope was that Russia would “invade” the Donbass (or, even better, the entire Ukraine) and liberate it from the Nazi crazies the Neocons put in power in Kiev. Such a Russian move would have been used as a “proof” that the evil revanchist Russkies are about to rebuild the Soviet Union, invade Eastern Europe and maybe even drive their tanks to the English channel. And if enough people would buy the “Russian threat” theory, they would also have to accept larger military budgets (to further fatten the US MIC) and more US forces deployed in Eastern Europe (where they would provide a much needed, and sometimes only, source of income). Then all the internal problems of Europe could be blamed on, or at least eclipsed by, the Russian

threat (in the “Putin wants a Brexit” style). But that irritating Putin did not take the bait and now Europe is stuck without a credible threat to terrorize people with. NATO, of course, and its prostitute-colonies in the Baltics and Poland likes to pretend that a Russian invasion is imminent, but nobody really believes this. According to some polls, even the people in the Baltics are dubious about the reality of a Russian threat (forget Poland: a country with a national hero like Pilsudski is a hopeless case)

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Józef\\_Piłsudski](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Józef_Piłsudski)).

But then, almost at the same moment when the Neocons came to realize that the Russians were not taking the bait, the steady flow of refugees coming from the Middle-East and Africa suddenly sharply increased, courtesy of the mayhem and chaos created by the Neocon policies in the Middle-East. How long do you think it took the rulers of the Empire to realize the fantastic opportunity this influx of refugees had just created for them?

First, this wave of refugees created a series of major social problems which could all be used to provide distractions from the massive credibility crisis and economic woes of the EU. No matter how bad the economic indicators are, you can always “hide them” behind a headline like “Refugee rapes 79yo woman at German cemetery” (true case: <https://www.rt.com/news/353485-germany-rape-refugee-cemetery/>).

Second, just at the time when the ruling comprador elites of the EU are threatened by popular discontent, the refugee crisis creates the perfect pretext to adopt emergency legislation and, possibly, introduce martial law.

Third, the worse the crisis in Europe becomes, the better it is for the US Dollar which becomes the safe(r) currency to run to.

Fourth, the more military units, as opposed to regular police forces, are deployed in Europe, the more the Europeans will get used to the notion that “only the military can protect us”.

Fifth, if, at the end of the day, the EU really tanks and riots, uprisings and chaos spread – guess who will show up to “save Europe yet again”? That’s right – Uncle Sam and NATO. Pretty good mission for an otherwise illegitimate leftover from the Cold War, no?

Ideally, the European population should become polarized between, on one hand, those who pretend the refugees are no problem at all, and those who blame everything on them. The more polarized the society becomes; the more there will be a “need” to keep law and order.

Does that all look familiar to you?

Yes, of course, this is also exactly what is happening in the USA with the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement.

While there are plenty of immigrants in the USA, they are mostly Hispanics and Asians

(<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2013/05/17/how-the-geography-of-u-s-immigration-has-changed-over-time/>) who adapt rather well to the US society. The good news for the US "deep state" is that Blacks in the USA can very much accomplish the same function as the refugees do in Europe: they are a vocal, a mostly deeply alienated minority, with a great deal of pent-up anger against the rest of society which can very easily be set-off to create riots and commit crimes. It is also rather easy to find a few crazies amongst these Blacks to start murdering policemen (the ideal symbol of the oppressive White establishment) and create a sense of crisis acute enough justify the use of police, National Guard and, potentially, military forces to restore and uphold "law and order".

Is it really a coincidence that the US Presidential elections feature extremely polarizing figures like Hillary and Trump and that low-levels of violence have already been triggered by the hysterically anti-Trump propaganda of the US corporate media?



Just imagine for one second what could happen in the USA if a “lone gunman” was to kill either Hillary or Trump? The society would literally explode and law and order would have to be “restored”.

The modalities might be different, but in both the EU and the USA we now see heavily armed and generally militarized forces in the streets to “protect” us from some exotic and scary threat.

Might that have something to do with the fact that the ruling elites are absolutely hated by the vast majority of Europeans and Americans? Of course it does!

I am convinced that what is taking place is the gradual suppression of the civil society under the pretext of protecting it – us – from some very scary threat. I am also convinced that part of this plan is to polarize our society as much as possible to create civil strife and to hide the real systemic and structural problems of our completely dysfunctional society and discredited and illegitimate political order.

The panem et circenses (bread and circuses) method only works in a society capable of providing enough wealth to its people to enjoy them. But when an Empire is agonizing, when its military cannot win wars anymore, when its leaders are being ridiculed, when its currency is being gradually weakened and even replaced and when its power is not feared anymore, then the Empire becomes unable to provide the minimal conditions needed to keep its subjects quiet and obedient. At this point the choice becomes simple: either find an external enemy or, at least, identify an internal one. This time around, the AngloZionists found what they think is the perfect combo: a diffuse/vague external threat (Islam) and an easily identifiable internal "carrier" threat (refugees in Europe, Blacks in the USA). The fact that the US government has been planning for various kinds of emergency rule or martial law

situations for years is not much of a secret (see: National Security Presidential Directive 51

(<https://fas.org/irp/offdocs/nspd/nspd-51.htm>)

and National Continuity Policy Implementation Plan

(<http://www.fema.gov/media-library-data/1384886826028-729844d3fd23ff85d94d52186c85748f/NCPIP.pdf>) or

Rex84 ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rex\\_84](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rex_84)) ). But now there is also evidence that the Germans are also planning for it.

(<http://www.zerohedge.com/news/2016-07-27/germany-admits-islamist-terror-has-arrived-it-prepares-deploy-army-crisis-situations>).

In fact, we can be confident that they are all doing it right now as we speak.

The last time around, when the Empire felt the need to regain control over Europe and prevent the election of anti-US political parties to power, they engaged in the notorious GLADIO false flag campaign

([https://wikispooks.com/wiki/Operation\\_Gladio](https://wikispooks.com/wiki/Operation_Gladio))

to neutralize the “Communist threat” (see full documentary here: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GGHXjO8wHsA>).

It appears that the same people are doing the same thing again, but this time against the putative “Islamic threat”.

(<http://www.zerohedge.com/news/2016-07-25/islam-vs-west-has-neo-operation-gladio-been-started>) And just to make sure that the common people really freak out, it appears that the AngloZionists have settled on a rather counter-intuitive plan:

- 1) Officially (politicians) condemn any anti-Islamic rhetoric.
- 2) Unofficially (media, public figures) constantly warn of the threat of Islamic extremism.
- 3) Take some highly visible but totally useless measures (TSA, anti-terror training) to defend against an Islamic attack.

4) Covertly but actively support Daesh-like Takfirism in the Middle-East and oppose and subvert those who, like the Russians, the Iranians, and the Syrians, really fight it on a daily basis.

What does such an apparently illogical and self-defeating plan achieve? Simple! It *maximizes fear* and *polarizes society*.

That kind of artificial polarization is nothing new. For example, this is why those who hate Obama call him a socialist (or even a communist) while those who hate Trump call him a fascist (even though in reality both Obama and Trump are just the figureheads of different capitalist factions of the same 1% elite).

What our imperial overlords really want is for us to either fight each other or, at least, fight windmills. Look at the American public – it is totally obsessed with non-issues like homosexual marriage, gun control vs. “active shooters”, Black Lives Matter vs. cops, and the time-tested pro-life vs. pro-abortion protests. To some minority of Americans these issues do matter, I suppose, but for the vast majority of Americans, these are total non-issue, meaningless crap which does not affect them in any way other than through the corporate media. This really reminds me of the Titanic's orchestra playing while the ship was sinking: the Empire is cracking at all its seams, there is a very real chance of a nuclear war with Russia and we are seriously discussing whether trannies should pee in male or female toilets when in the Target store. (<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-36195315>) This is crazy, of course, but this is hardly coincidental. This is how our leaders want us: terrified, confused and, above all, distracted.

Frankly, I am pessimistic for the near to mid-term future. When I see how easily the “Islamic threat” canard has been bought not only by official propagandists but even by otherwise mostly rational and educated people, I see that 9/11 has taught us very little. Just like a bull in a bullfight we are still willing to go after any

red rag put before our noses regardless of who is actually holding that rag or actually making us bleed.

The good news is that regardless of our gullible passivity, the Empire is coming down, maybe not as fast as some of us would wish, but fast enough to really worry our rulers. Look at the Israelis – they have already read the writing on the wall and are now in the process of changing patrons, hence their newfound big friendship with Russia – a marriage of convenience for both sides, entered into with both sides holding their noses. Ditto for Erdogan who has apparently decided that neither the EU nor the US could be considered reliable protectors. Even the Saudis have tried, however clumsily and crudely to get the Russians on their side:

(<http://sputniknews.com/politics/20160723/1043521657/russia-saudi-arabia-assad.html>)

For the time being, the "Islamic threat" show will continue, as will the "active shooters", Black Lives Matter, and all the rest of the program brought to us by the Empire. False flags will continue to flutter in great numbers in the Empire's hot air.



# Assessing the Russian military as an instrument of power

August 25, 2016

It has been a quarter of a century now since the fall of the Soviet Union and yet the memory of the Soviet Armed Forces is still vivid in the minds of many of those who lived through the Cold War or even remember WWII. The NATO-sponsored elites of Eastern Europe still continue to scare their citizens by warning of a danger of "Russian tanks" rolling down their streets as if the Soviet tanks were about to advance on Germany again. For a while, the accepted image of a Russian soldier in the West was a semi-literate drinking and raping Ivan who would attack in immense hordes with little tactical skills and an officer corps selected for political loyalty and lack of imagination. Then the propaganda narrative changed and now the new Russian bogeyman is a "little green man"

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Little\\_green\\_men\\_\(Ukrainian\\_crisis\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Little_green_men_(Ukrainian_crisis)))) who will suddenly show up to annex some part of the Baltics to Russia. Putatively pro-Russian "experts" add to the confusion by publicly hallucinating of a Russian deployment in Syria and the Mediterranean which could wrestle the entire region away from Uncle Sam and fight the entire NATO/CENCOM air forces and navies with confidence. This is all nonsense, of course, and what I propose to do here is to provide a few very basic pointers about what the modern Russian military can and cannot do in 2016. This will not be a highly technical discussion but rather a list of a few simple, basic, reminders.

## Russia is not the Soviet Union

The first and most important thing to keep in mind is that the Russian military is truly focused on the defense of the Russian territory. Let me immediately say that contrary to much of the Cold War propaganda, the Soviet military was also defensive in essence, even if it did include a number of offensive elements:

1) The military control of all of Eastern Europe as a “buffer zone” to keep the US/NATO away from the Soviet Union’s borders.

2) An official ideology, Communism, which was messianic and global in its stated goals (more or less, depending on who was in power)

3) A practice of global opposition to the US Empire anywhere on the planet with technical, political, financial, scientific and, of course, military means.

*Russia has exactly zero interest in any of these.* Not only did the nature of modern warfare dramatically reduce the benefits of being forward deployed, the messianic aspects of Communism have even been abandoned by the Communist Party of Russia which is now focused on the internal socio-economic problems of Russia and which has no interest whatsoever in liberating the Polish or Austrian proletariat from Capitalist exploitation. As for a global military presence, Russia has neither the means nor the desire to waste her very limited resources on faraway territories which do not contribute to her defense.

But the single most important factor here is this: the overwhelming majority of Russians are tired and fed up with being an empire. From Peter I to Gorbachev, the Russian people have paid a horrific price in sweat, tears, blood, and Rubles to maintain an empire which did absolutely nothing for the Russian people except impoverish them and make them hated in much of the

world. More than anything else, the Russians want their country to be a "normal" country. Yes, safe, powerful, wealthy and respected, but still a normal country and not a global superpower. Many Russians still remember that the Soviet Politburo justified the occupation and subsequent war in Afghanistan as the completion of an "internationalist duty" and if somebody today tried that kind of language the reply would be "to hell with that". Finally, there is the sad reality that almost all the countries which were liberated by Russia, not only from Nazi Germany but also from the Turkish yoke show exactly zero gratitude for the role Russia played in their liberation. To see how our so-called "Orthodox brothers" in Bulgaria, Romania or Georgia are eager to deploy NATO weapons against Russia is nothing short of sickening. The next time around, let these guys liberate themselves, everybody will be happier that way.

It is a basic rule of military analysis that you do not look at the intentions but primarily at capabilities, so let us now look at Russian capabilities.

### **The Russian armed forces are relatively small**

First, the Russian armed forces are fairly small, especially for the defense of the biggest country on the planet (Russia is almost twice the size of the USA; she has about half the population and land border length of 20,241km). The total size of the Russian Armed Forces is estimated at about 800,000 soldiers. That puts the Russian Armed Forces in 5th position worldwide, somewhere between the DPRK (1,190,000) and Pakistan (643,800).

(<http://www.worldatlas.com/articles/29-largest-armies-in-the-world.html>)

Truly, this kind of “bean counting” makes absolutely no sense, but this comparison is useful to show something crucial: **the Russian Armed Forces are relatively small.**

This conclusion is further bolstered if we consider the fact that it is hard to imagine a scenario in which every Russian soldier from Kaliningrad to the Kamchatka will be engaged at the same time against one enemy. This is why the Russian territory has been broken up into five separate (and, *de facto*, autonomous) military districts (or “strategic directions”): East, Central, Northern, Western and Southern.

While there are a number of units which are subordinated directly to the high command in Moscow, most Russian units have been distributed between the commands of these strategic directions.

[Sidebar: It is also interesting to know that when Putin came to power the Western military district was almost demilitarized as nobody in Russia believed that there was a threat coming from the West. The aggressive US/NATO policies have now changed that and there now is a major program underway to strengthen it, including the reactivation of the First Guards Tank Army.]

There is no US equivalent to the Russian military districts. Or, if there is, it is very different in nature and scope. I am talking about the US Unified Combatant Commands which have broken up our entire planet into “Areas of Responsibility”.

Notice that all of Russia is in the area of “responsibility” of only one of these commands, USEUCOM. In reality, however, in the case of full-scale war between Russia and the United States



USCENTCOM and USPACOM would, obviously, play a crucial role.

## **The Russians are \*not\* coming**

The size and capabilities of the Russian Military Districts are completely dwarfed by the immense power and resources of the US Commands: in every one of these commands the USA already has deployed forces, pre-positioned equipment and built the infrastructure needed to receive major reinforcements. Furthermore, since the USA currently has about seven hundred military bases worldwide, the host countries have been turned into a modern version of a colony, a protectorate, which has no option than to fully collaborate with the USA and which has to offer all its resources in manpower, equipment, infrastructure, etc. to the USA in case of war. To put it simply: all of Europe is owned by the USA who can use it as they want (mainly as cannon fodder against Russia, of course).

It is important to keep this immense difference in size and capabilities in mind when, for example, we look at the Russian operation in Syria.

When the first rumors of an impending Russian intervention began flooding the blogosphere, many were tempted to say that the Russians were about to liberate Syria, challenge NATO, and defeat Daesh. Some had visions of Russian Airborne Forces deployed into Damascus, MiG-31s crisscrossing the Syrian skies and even Russian SLBMs cruising off the Syrian coast (though they never explained this one). At the time I tried to explain that no, the "Russians are not coming".

(see (<http://thesaker.is/a-russian-military-intervention-in-syria-i-very-much-doubt-it/>),

(<http://thesaker.is/on-russian-military-interventions-or-lack-thereof/>),

(<http://thesaker.is/the-most-anticipated-showdown-in-recent-history-or-a-load-of-bullcrap-saker-rant/>),

(<http://www.unz.com/tsaker/so-what-are-the-russians-really-doing-in-syria/>,

and

(<http://thesaker.is/finally-some-clarity-about-the-russian-plans-about-syria/>)).

But my cautionary remarks were not greeted with enthusiasm, to put it mildly. A Russian task force did eventually materialize in Syria, but it was a very far cry from what was expected. In fact, compared to the expected intervention force, it was tiny: 50 aircraft and support personnel. What this small force achieved, however, was much more than anybody expected, including me. So what happened here? Did the Russians really do everything they can, or did they get cold feet or were they somehow pressured into a much less ambitious mission than they had originally envisioned?

To explain this, we now need to look at the actual capabilities of the Russian Armed Forces.

## **The true “reach” of the Russian armed forces**

First, Russia does have very long range weapon systems: her missiles can reach any point on the planet, her bombers can fly many thousands of miles and her transport aircraft have ranges of several thousand miles. However, and this is crucial, none of that amounts to a real power projection capability. There are two main ways to project power: to take control over a territory or, failing that to deny it to your enemy. The first one absolutely requires the famous "boots on the ground" while the second one requires air supremacy. So how far away from home can the Russian soldier

and pilots really fight? How far from home can the Russian Aerospace forces establish a no-fly zone?

Let's begin by dispelling a myth: that Russian Airborne Forces are more or less similar to the US 82<sup>nd</sup> or 101<sup>st</sup> Airborne. They are not. The 82<sup>nd</sup> and 101<sup>st</sup> are light infantry divisions which are typically engaged in what I would call "colonial enforcement" missions. In comparison to the US airborne forces, the Russian Airborne Forces are much heavier, fully mechanized and their main mission is to fight in the operational level support of the front to a maximum depth of 100km to 300km (if I remember correctly, the Russian Aerospace Forces don't even have sufficient aircraft to airlift an entire Airborne Division although they will acquire that capability in 2017). Once landed, the Russian Airborne Division is a much more formidable force than its US counterpart: not only are the Russians fully mechanized, they have their own artillery and, most importantly, they are far more tactically mobile than the Americans.

But ***what the Russians gain in tactical mobility, they lose in strategic mobility***; the US can easily send the 82<sup>nd</sup> pretty much to any location on the planet, whereas the Russians most definitely cannot do that with their Airborne Forces.

Furthermore, even a Russian Airborne Division is relatively weak and fragile, especially when compared to regular armed forces, so they are critically dependent on the support of the Russian Aerospace forces. That, again, dramatically reduces the "reach" of these forces. All this is to say that no, the Russian Airborne Troops (*Vozdushno-desantnye voyska (VDV)*) never had the means to send an Airborne Division/Brigade/Regiment to Damascus any more than they had the means to support the Russian VDV company in Pristina.

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Incident\\_at\\_Pristina\\_airport](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Incident_at_Pristina_airport))

This is not a weakness of the Russian Airborne Forces, it is simply the logical consequence of the fact that the entire Russian military posture is purely defensive in nature, at least strategically.

Like any other modern military force, the Russians are capable of offensive military operations; but those would be executed primarily as a part of a defensive plan or as a part of a counter-attack. And while the Russian Ground Forces (aka "Army") have excellent terrain crossing capabilities, they are all designed for missions of less than a couple of hundred kilometers in depth.

This is why in the past I have written that the Russian Armed Forces are designed to fight on their national territory and up to a maximum of 1000km from the Russian border. Now, please do not take this "1000km" literally. In reality, 200km-400km would be much more realistic, and I would say that **the capabilities of the Russian military diminish in a manner roughly inversely proportional to the square of the distance from the Russian borders.**

Keep in mind that the real distance the Russian armed forces can "reach" is not primarily determined by distance, but much more by terrain and the possible defenses encountered in this zone. Flying over Estonia to reach the Baltic Sea would be much easier than to fly over Turkey to reach Syria. It is much easier to cross the Ukrainian plains than it would be to cross the snow-covered forests of Finland. Again, the conceptual 1000km distance would often be much shorter in the real world.

If we now take a closer look at the Middle-East, here is what we see:

Notice that Khmeimim is just at the edge of this 1000km distance, but only 50km from the Turkish border and that in order to resupply it the Russians would need to cross Turkish airspace or fly around Turkey via Iran and Iraq. In other words, Khmeimim and Damascus are way too far for the Russian armed forces to

insert anything but a relatively small force and give it a relatively limited mission. And while the Russians were extremely successful in Syria, I would argue that Putin took a huge risk, even if he, and the Russian General Staff, calculated the odds correctly and achieved a truly remarkable success.

Has the recent Iranian offer to use the Hamedān airbase made a difference in Russian capabilities?

Yes and no. Yes because it will now make it possible for the Russians to use their Tu-22M3 in a much more effective way and no because this improvement does not fundamentally change the regional balance of power or allow the Russian to project their forces into Syria. To put it simply: the Russians are years away from being capable of executing something similar to what the USA did during “Desert Shield”. In fact, such operations are not even part of the Russian military doctrine and the Russians have no desire to develop any such capability. There is a reason why the AngloZionist Empire is broken: maintaining a global empire is prohibitively expensive, the Russians painfully learned that lesson in the past and they have no desire to emulate the USA today. Doing so would not only require a dramatic change in the Russian military posture but also to imitate the US political and economic model, something Russia neither desires nor is capable of.

There are, however, also big advantages to the Russian force posture, the main one being that Russians will only fight on "their turf" not only in terms of location but also in terms of capabilities. The very same inverse square “law” which so severely limits the Russian military power projection capabilities also acts in Russia’s favor when dealing with an enemy approaching the Russian border: the closer this enemy gets, the more dangerous his environment becomes. In practical terms, this means that the three Baltic States, the Baltic Sea, the Gulf of Finland, most of the Ukraine, the Black Sea and the Caspian are all, for all practical

purposes, "Russkie-land". The fact that NATO pretends otherwise makes no difference here: the kind of firepower and capabilities which Russia can bring to bear simply dwarfs what the US and NATO can commit. This is not an issue of the number of tanks, or helicopters or combat aircraft, it is the fact that over and near the Russian territory the Russian armed forces would act as an integrated whole, exactly what they cannot do as far away as, say, in Syria. So even if NATO can, in theory, bring more aircraft to the battle, Russian aircraft would be supported by the multi-layered and fully integrated Russian air defense network, a large number of sophisticated electronic warfare systems which, together with highly capable and long-range interceptors: land-based like the S-400 or airborne like the MiG-31BM would make it extremely dangerous for US/NATO aircraft to get anywhere near Russian airspace, especially for the AWACs the US air doctrine completely depends on.

## **The real meaning of A2AD**

The US and NATO are, of course, very much aware of this. And as is typically the case, they concealed this reality behind an obscure acronym: A2AD,

(<https://www.usnwc.edu/getattachment/3e3ba751-8674-4175-9672-404d967f4355/8---A2AD.aspx>)

which stands for anti-access area denial. According to US strategists

(<https://www.amazon.com/Anti-Access-Warfare-Countering-A2-Strategies/dp/1612511864>),

Russia, China, and even Iran are plotting to use A2AD strategies against the USA. What this means in plain English is simple, of course: some countries out there actually can fight back and defend themselves (hence the burning aircraft carrier on the cover of the

book). The arrogance of it all is simply amazing: it is not like the USA is concerned about Iranian A2AD in Paraguay, Russian A2AD in Africa or even Chinese A2AD in the Gulf of Mexico. No, the USA is concerned about these countries defending their own borders. Indeed, how dare they?!

Fortunately for the world, Uncle Sam only gets to whine here, but cannot do much about it except conceal these realities from the general public in the West and obfuscate the dangers of messing with the wrong countries under bizarre acronyms like A2AD. And that brings me to the Ukraine.

A quick look at a 1000km map will immediately show that the Ukraine is also well within the conceptual “Russkie-land” zone (again, don’t take 1000km literally, and remember that this is a maximum, a couple of hundred kilometers are much more realistic). This does not at all mean that Russia would want, or should, attack or invade the Ukraine (the Baltic states and Poland, for that matter), but it does mean that such an operation is well within the Russian capabilities (at least if we forget about public opinion in Russia) and that to try to counter that would take a truly immense effort, something nobody in the West has the means to undertake.

In truth, that kind of scenario only exists in the demented minds of western propagandists and in the artificial world of US think tanks which make providing the politicians with frightening fairy tales their daily bread. (For an example of the latter, see <https://prodev2go.files.wordpress.com/2015/10/rus-ukr-lessons-draft.pdf>). To be sure, the fact that both sides have long-range standoff weapons, including nuclear ones, makes such a scenario even less likely unless we assume that the Russians have gone insane and are trying to force the US to resort to nuclear weapons. The opposite scenario – the US taking the risk of forcing Russia to use her nukes – is, alas, not quite as unlikely, especially if the

Neocons take full control of the White House. The difference? The Russians know that they are neither invulnerable nor invincible, the Americans don't. This is why the latter are far more likely to trigger a conflict than the former.

A full-scale war between the USA and Russia would be far different from anything described here: it would last a week, maybe two, it would involve conventional and nuclear strikes on both the USA and Russia, and it would be fought primarily with standoff weapons, "Boots on the ground" or armored warfare would matter very little in such a scenario.

### **The Ukraine is located well inside Russkie-land**

So if in Syria the "Russians are not coming", then in the Ukraine they are already there. I am not referring to the sending of equipment (the *voentorg*) or volunteers (the "*northern wind*") but to the fact that the Ukraine and, especially, the Donbass are so close to the Russian border as being basically undeniable to the Russians should they decide to take it. Again, I am not suggesting that they will, or even that this should happen, but only that all the hot air from the regime in Kiev about "defending Europe against the Russian hordes" or "teaching NATO how to fight the Russians" is absolute nonsense. Ditto for the talk about supplying "lethal weapons" to the Ukronazis. Why? Because the situation in the Donbass is extremely simple: it is highly unlikely that the Ukronazis would succeed in taking over the Donbass but if, by some miracle, they did, they would be destroyed by the Russian armed forces. Putin has made it abundantly clear that while he will not intervene militarily in the Ukraine, he will not allow genocide to take place in Novorussia. In fact, just the Russian artillery deployed along the border has the means to destroy any Ukrainian force invading Novorussia. In fact, that is exactly what happened in



July of 2014 when, in a single cross-border 2 minutes long fire strike by Russian multiple rocket launchers and long-range artillery guns, they completely destroyed two Ukrainian mechanized battalions (a first in the history of warfare).

As I wrote many times, all parties to the conflict know that, and the only real goal of the Ukronazis is to trigger a Russian intervention in the Donbass, while the Russians are trying to avoid it by covertly supporting the Novorussians. That's it. It is that simple. But the notion of the Ukronazis ever getting their hands on the Donbass or, even less so, Crimea, is absolutely ridiculous as even the combined power of the US and NATO could not make that happen.

## **Conclusion: Russia ain't the Soviet Union and it ain't the USA**

It is absolutely amazing how hard it is for so many people to understand the seemingly simple fact that Russia is neither a USSR v2 nor an anti-USA. It is therefore absolutely essential to repeat over and over again that the Russia of 2016 has no aspirations to become an empire and no means to become a global challenger to the AngloZionist hegemony over our planet. So what does Russia want? It is simple: Russia simply wants to be a sovereign and free country. That's it. But in a world ruled by the AngloZionist Empire, this is also a lot. In fact, I would say that for the international plutocracy ruling the Empire, this Russian aspiration is completely and categorically unacceptable as it sees this Russian desire as an existential threat to the USA and the entire New World Order the Empire is trying to impose upon all of us. They are absolutely correct, by the way.

If Russia is allowed to break free from the Empire, then this means the end for the Empire's global domination project as other

countries will inevitably follow suit. Not only that, but this would deprive the Empire of the immense Russian resources in energy, potable water, strategic metals, etc. If Russia is allowed to break free and succeed, then Europe will inevitably gravitate towards Russia due to objective economic and political factors. Losing Europe would mean the end of the AngloZionist Empire. Everybody understands that and this is why the ruling 1%ers have unleashed the most hysterical full-spectrum Russophobic propaganda campaign in western history. So yes, Russia and the Empire are already at war, a war for survival from which only one side will walk away while the other will be eliminated, at least in its current political form. This war is a new type of war, however; one which is roughly **80% informational, 15% economic and 5% military**. This is why the ban on the Russian Paralympic team is every bit as important as the delivery of US and British counter-battery radars to the Nazi junta in Kiev.

If militarily and economically Russia is dramatically weaker than the US-led block of all the countries forming the Empire, on the informational front Russia is doing much better. It is enough to see all the hysterics of Western politicians about RT to see that they are most definitely feeling threatened in an area which they used to completely dominate: information operations (aka propaganda).

The goals of Russia are quite simple:

- a) Military: to survive (defensive military doctrine)
- b) Economic: to become truly sovereign (to remove the 5<sup>th</sup> columnists from power)
- c) Informational: to discredit and de-legitimize the Empire's political and economic basis

That's it. Unlike the grandiose hopes of those who wish to see the Russian military intervene everywhere, these 3 goals are commensurate with the actual capabilities/means of Russia.

One cannot win a war by engaging in the kind of warfare the enemy excels at. You have to impose upon him the kind of warfare you excel at. If Russia tried to "out-USA the USA" she would inevitably lose. She therefore chose to be different in order to prevail.

There are still many out there who are nostalgic for the "good old days" of the Cold War when any anti-US movement, party, regime or insurgency would automatically get the support of the USSR. These are the folks who deeply regret that Russia did not liberate the Ukraine from the Nazi junta, who fault Russia for not standing up to the USA in Syria and who are baffled, if not disgusted, by the apparently cozy relationship between Moscow and Tel Aviv. I understand these people, at least to some degree, but I also see what they plainly fail to realize: Russia is still much weaker than the AngloZionist Empire and because of that Russia will always prefer a bad peace to a good war. Besides, it is not like there was a long line of countries waiting to defend Russia when her interests were affected. Does anybody know which countries, besides Russia, have recognized Abkhazia and South Ossetia? Answer: Nicaragua, Venezuela, and Nauru!

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International\\_recognition\\_of\\_Abkhazia\\_and\\_South\\_Ossetia#States\\_formally\\_recognising\\_Abkhazia\\_or\\_South\\_Ossetia\\_as\\_independent](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_recognition_of_Abkhazia_and_South_Ossetia#States_formally_recognising_Abkhazia_or_South_Ossetia_as_independent))

Yep, not even Kazakhstan or Syria... Isn't friendship and partnership a two-way street?

The truth is that Russia does not owe anything to anybody. But even more importantly, Russia does simply not have the means to engage in a planetary zero-sum game against the AngloZionist Empire. Since Vladimir Putin came to power he achieved a quasi-

miracle: he made Russia into a semi-sovereign state. Yes, I wrote semi-sovereign because while Russia is militarily safe she remains economically subservient to the AngloZionist Empire. Compared to the Empire, her economy is tiny and her armed forces only capable of defending the Russian homeland. And yet, just as the tiny Russian contingent in Khmeimim achieved results way superior to anything which could have been expected from it, Russia is still the only power on the planet who dares to openly say “*niet*” to the AngloZionist Hegemon and to even openly challenge and even ridicule its legitimacy and so-called ‘values’.

The war between the Empire and Russia will be a long one, and its outcome will remain uncertain for many years but, as the Russian saying goes, “Russia does not start wars, she ends them”. The Papacy fought against Russia for 1000 years. The Crusaders for roughly a century; The Swedish Empire for 21 years; Napoleon for just a few months; Queen Victoria, Napoleon III and Abdülmecid I (what I call the “Ecumenical Coalition against Russia”) for about 3 years; Kaiser Wilhelm II also for 3 years; The Trotskyists for a decade; Hitler for 4 years; The Jewish mobsters (aka “oligarchs”) for 9 years. And yes, they all eventually were defeated, even after a temporary victory, but each time Russia paid a huge price in blood and suffering. This time around, the Russian leaders have chosen a different strategy, they try as hard as possible not to give the West a pretext for a full-scale military confrontation. So far, this strategy has been successful and besides two terrorist attacks (in Egypt and Syria) and a two-year long recession (apparently ending soon), Russia did not have to pay the horrendous price countries at war with the West typically have had to pay. It would be delusional to expect the Russians to change course at this time, especially since time is now clearly on the Russian side. Just look at all the problems all the enemies of Russia have to which she does not have to contribute at all: the US and EU are both in a deep and

potentially devastating political crisis, the US is sitting on an economic time-bomb while the EU is quite literally imploding. The Ukraine has turned into a textbook example of a failed state and is likely to break apart, while Turkey is undergoing the worst crisis since its foundation. And each passing day just makes things worse and worse for the Empire. This reminds me of the monolog of Captain Willard in the movie "Apocalypse Now": *"I'm here a week now... waiting for a mission... getting softer. Every minute I stay in this room, I get weaker, and every minute Charlie squats in the bush, he gets stronger. Each time I looked around the walls moved in a little tighter"*. Replace Charlie with Ivan and the jungle with the taiga, and you get a pretty good picture of the dynamic taking place: every day the walls of the Empire are moving in a little tighter while the AngloZionists are completely clueless as to what to do to stop this.

## **Conclusion**

In international affairs, as in many other areas, it is better to never say never. So I will only say that to see the Russian armed forces going into an offensive operation remains exceedingly unlikely. Nor will Russia defend even an important partner at "any cost". The primary mission and military posture of the Russian armed forces will remain fundamentally defensive and while Russia might use her armed forces in support of a political goal or to help an ally, she will do that with extreme caution not to allow that engagement to escalate into a regional war or, even less so, a direct war against the Empire.

Unlike the West where a possible war with Russia is almost never discussed (and, when it is, it is done in an absolutely ridiculous manner)

(<http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b06zw32h>), the prospects of

war with the West are discussed in the Russian media on an almost daily basis, including on the main, state-funded TV stations. As for the Russian armed forces, they are engaged in huge rearmament and force training program which, so far, has been roughly 50% completed. Should the Neocon "crazies in the basement" ([http://www.opednews.com/articles/opedne\\_donald\\_a\\_080423\\_leo\\_strauss\\_and\\_the\\_.htm](http://www.opednews.com/articles/opedne_donald_a_080423_leo_strauss_and_the_.htm)) trigger a war, they will find Russia ready, militarily and psychologically, to fight and to win, no matter what the costs. But Russia will never again volunteer for the role of global anti-US agent or engage her armed forces if there is a viable alternative to such an engagement. So no, most definitely not, the Russians are not coming.



# The case for the breakup of the Ukraine

September 01, 2016

Just as the corporate media is not reporting that the USA and Russia are on a collision course which can end up in a nuclear war, the corporate media is not reporting that the Ukraine is falling apart. That does not mean, however, that this is not happening. It is. In fact, it has been for a long while already, but since that collapse is smoothed out by a lack of military action and by the political support of the Empire, it does not appear to be catastrophic (in the sense of causing a sudden dramatic change). But the signs are all over the place, ranging from the outright bizarre attack by Ukronazi saboteurs on Crimea (which, besides the group which was caught also being involved with at least two other groups conducting a diversionary reconnaissance by fire against the northeast of the Peninsula) to the quasi-daily reports of an "imminent", but apparently never coming, Ukronazi attack against the Donbass. On the political front, the Ukrainian Jeanne d'Arc, Nadezhda Savchenko, is now accused of being a Putin agent because she advocates for negotiations with the DNR/LNR, while the regime in Kiev is trying to maintain its relevance to NATO hawks by offering to teach them "how to fight against the Russians". The reality, of course, is that financial support from the Empire to the Ukraine has now almost completely dried up due to, among other things, the realization that the Ukies can steal almost all the money they get, and that nobody buys "the Russkies are coming!" canard anymore. Frankly, the Ukronazi project has outlived its utility and nobody gives a damn what will happen to the Ukrainian people.

And that is a huge mistake.

## Somalia on the EU

It is impossible to estimate how many people are still living in the Ukraine today, but most experts believe that the figure is somewhere between 35-40 million people. The vast majority of them are struggling to make a living and their future looks very, very bleak. Remember Dmitri Orlov's five stages of collapse? (<http://cluborlov.blogspot.com/p/the-five-stages-of-collapse.html>) They are:

Stage 1: Financial collapse. Faith in “business as usual” is lost.

Stage 2: Commercial collapse. Faith that “the market shall provide” is lost.

Stage 3: Political collapse. Faith that “the government will take care of you” is lost.

Stage 4: Social collapse. Faith that “your people will take care of you” is lost.

Stage 5: Cultural collapse. Faith in “the goodness of humanity” is lost.

Even a cursory look at what is happening in the Ukraine clearly shows that Stage 5 has already been reached, quite a while ago, really. What comes next is basically Somalia. But a big, really big, Somalia, with millions of assault rifles circulating in the population, with major industrial sites capable of triggering another Chernobyl-like disaster, with various death-squads (private or semi-official) freely roaming around the country and imposing their rule with armored vehicles and heavy machine guns. So if the always Euro-centric West could afford to ignore a Somalia in Somalia there is no way it can ignore a Somalia on the EU and NATO border. To put it simply: there is absolutely nothing standing between the Somalia in the Ukraine and the EU. Nothing.



Once the inevitable and this time catastrophic final collapse happens the resulting explosion will simply take the path of least resistance.

To the east, we have Russia, with her superbly capable state security agencies, the newly created National Guard, large military formations deployed along the borders and, most importantly, an excellent understanding of what is taking place in the Ukraine. To the west we have basically Conchita Wurst's Europe, unable to formulate any policy at all (since all orders come from Uncle Sam), with parade-type military forces mostly hallucinating about the "Russian threat", with security services who can't even cope with the current flow of immigrants and, most importantly, with a ruling class and population which has no clue or understanding whatsoever of what is happening in the Ukraine.

Russia has another huge advantage: she already controls Crimea and Novorussia and she has already developed the skill set needed to deal with millions of refugees. Yup, while Western leaders were busy blaming Russia for everything and making absolutely crazy promises to the Ukrainians, Russia has already had to absorb about 1.5 million refugees which did not only have to be carefully vetted for Nazi saboteurs and terrorists but then also intelligently relocated. The immigration service did a pretty good job here too by, for example, relocating medical doctors to regions where they were needed (including Chechnia).

All this is to say that when the inevitable explosion happens, the Europeans will be the ones to get hit the hardest and who will have to scramble to cope with the situation. Seeing how utterly incompetent and clueless the EU *comprador elites* are, we can fully expect them to make a total mess of the situation, as they always do, and end up worrying, mostly about the political fallout resulting from the disaster.

The Americans, protected by the Atlantic Ocean, will do the usual: provider “leadership” and “support” but not offer a single dollar to address the actual measures needed to deal with the situation. Politically, they will do in the Ukraine what they have always done in such situations: declare victory and leave.

At this point the situation will become so undeniably bad that even western politicians will have to get out of their delusional comfort zone: they will then fly to Moscow to get the Russians to fix this mess.

### **The Russians ain’t coming (yet again)**

I will never cease to mantrically repeat that Russia is much weaker than what most people think. Her landmass is immense and her military arguably the best on the planet, but the population is relatively small, and her economy a struggling one. Yes, the future does look bright for Russia, but presently she simply does not have the means to single-handedly rescue (resurrect, really) the Ukraine. Not even close.

The reality is that even Crimea has presented Russia with major challenges. After 25 years of total neglect, Crimea basically needs to completely rebuild most of its infrastructure. The Kremlin has poured billions of Rubles into numerous and large modernization programs, including an immensely expensive but vitally needed bridge over the Kerch Strait ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kerch\\_Strait\\_Bridge](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kerch_Strait_Bridge)), and she will continue to rebuild Crimea in spite of the immense costs involved. Down the road, of course, Crimea will end up being very wealthy, courtesy of an immense touristic potential, the presence of a much expanded Black Sea fleet and because of its strategic location. But for the foreseeable future, Crimea will remain a major burden which Russia will struggle to deal with.

The situation in the Donbass is even bleaker. If Crimea was neglected, the Donbass has been almost totally destroyed. Right now the Russians are paying the pensions of the local population because the Ukronazis have stolen them, in direct violation of the Minsk Agreements. Russia is also alone in supporting the Novorussian republics with humanitarian, medical, technical, administrative and military programs. And while the Novorussians have done an amazing job rebuilding much of Donetsk and a few other cities, most of what lies within artillery range of the Ukronazi forces still lies in ruins and the economy is more or less at a standstill. This will not change until peace truly returns to the region.

What is already quite evident is that regardless of who will be in the Kremlin and regardless of how much good will and self-sacrifice the Russians will have, Russia simply does not have the means to salvage the Ukraine. It just ain't happening. Furthermore, polls show that most Russians are categorically opposed to a full re-integration of the entire Ukraine into Russia. Who could blame them? They are not only acutely aware that the Ukraine has turned into one bloody hell of a mess, but that an entire generation of Ukrainians has now been terminally brainwashed with Russophobic hatred. And, frankly, Russia has no use for Nazis of any kind, even if they are fellow Slavs or even if they are basically the very same nation as the Russian one.

So even if tomorrow Petro Poroshenko and his gang decided to invite the Russians to come in and fix this bloody mess, the Russians would decline (so much for the warnings about a Russian invasion!). Oh sure, there are a lot of Ukrainians who kid themselves and think that "the Russians will come and fix this", but this is a pipe-dream: the Russians ain't coming. At most, Russia will let the DNR/LNR get back the territories which belonged to their regions and Mariupol might be liberated. But that's about it.

And even if by some miracle the Novorussian tanks end up in Kiev, I don't see them staying there for very long because the Kremlin fully understands that if they grab it, they own it and they have to fix it. Eventually, Russia will, of course, simply be forced to absorb the Donbass and make it a part of Russia, mostly because there is no way the Donbass will ever go back to the Ukraine again, but even this process will take time. By then, with both Crimea and the Donbass under her responsibility, Russia will simply be maxed out, economically unable to absorb any further territories (sorry, Balts, no Russian invasion for you either!).

### **The main problem**

So the Russians can't afford it, the Europeans can't do anything and the Americans have left. What happens next?

What happens next is that the worse the situation becomes the stronger the obvious need for an international effort will become. Once the Russians tell the Europeans in no equivocal terms "forget about our invasion, we are not doing it" (by then the Europeans will \*beg\* the Russians to invade!), the Europeans will have to turn to their American masters and tell them that the EU will be regime-changed unless something is urgently done. At which point, Uncle Sam will have to open his purse and offer some real money (assuming the Dollar is still a viable currency when that happens). But even if that happens, I don't see the main donors agreeing on a Ukrainian project.

In purely political terms, the most likely solution would be to have a neutral Ukrainian confederation of some kind. You know – nobody wins, nobody loses and we all remain friends. Sounds nice of course, but it does not address the main problem of the Ukraine: it is a completely artificial country and it is simply way too big. Add to this a level of corruption and an expertise in

misappropriating funds which Somalis can't even begin to imagine, and you have a country which can probably "absorb" even a major donor's help effort and remain in ruins. Finally, there is the reality that the folks living in the western Ukraine are completely different from those in the south or east and that even if we remove the Nazi Banderites from the equation there is no such thing as a "Ukrainian nation" with a common project.

### **Small is beautiful**

But imagine if the unitary Ukraine was allowed to break-up, under international supervision and, if needed, even under international military protection, into several smaller states. For one thing, this would immediately take care of the neutrality issue: even if western Ukraine joined NATO, Russia would not care much. That would also solve the language problem: not only could each region chose one, or several, official languages, but since these newly independent states would be far more homogeneous, they would have much fewer concerns about accepting a second official language of a relatively small minority (big minorities are usually seen as threat, not small ones). A break-up of the Ukraine into several independent states could also make it much easier for each newly created state to sign bilateral agreements with its neighbors without having to get the agreement of folks living hundreds of kilometers away and interested in a totally different set of agreements with their own neighbors. Finally, small states are much easier to integrate into larger unions (EU or EEU) than huge ones.

Breaking up the Ukraine also presents a number of advantages to any peacekeeping/peace enforcement efforts. For example, while I don't believe that the Russians would be willing to invade or annex most of the Ukraine, even east of the Dniepr river, I do

believe that the Russians would be willing to send in a peacekeeping/peace enforcement force to provide security during a stabilization and transition phase, provided that this operation is sanctioned by a UN Security Council resolution and has the support of all the major players. Likewise, NATO might \*finally\* find a useful role for itself doing something similar west of the Dniepr river (and since NATO countries are the ones who armed the Nazis, it would be only fair to ask them to now disarm them).

### **Problems, caveats, and risks**

Of course, just as any other break-up of a country, this plan does have major flaws and creates as many risks as it offers opportunities. First and foremost, breaking up any country, no matter how artificial that country is, just creates more artificial borders, at least temporarily. That, in turn, sharply increases the risk of violence. But let's be honest here: the Ukraine has already been broken up into at least three parts (occupied Banderastan, Novorussia, and Crimea), and a civil war has already broken out. What is left of the Ukraine today is already extremely violent and it is pretty darn clear that things ain't gonna get better anytime soon. So we have to compare the comparable and not compare an admittedly bad situation to an invented ideal one. Those who will now object to the break-up of the Ukraine should have taken action before 2014 and not supported a coup which was bound to result in a civil war: Humpty Dumpty is broken now, and all that can still be salvaged are his various pieces.

Besides, we have to keep in mind that the Ukraine is a completely artificial country whose current borders are the creation of Vladimir Lenin and Joseph Stalin (something the Ukronazis assiduously avoid remembering). So it's not like we are discussing the break-up of, say, Japan or France. Finally, I don't see

why some countries are considered prime candidates for break-up (Yugoslavia for example) while other WWII borders would be sacrosanct.

Some will, no doubt, accuse me of being a "Putin agent" for suggesting that the Ukraine ought to be broken up. Others will accuse me of being a CIA/Mossad agent for suggesting that NATO might actually have a legitimate mission west of the Dniepr river. That kind of *ad hominem*s come with the territory and I have long learned to ignore them. All I will reply to those accusations is that while I lay 100% of the blame for the disaster in the Ukraine on the AngloZionist Empire, I also see that now this has become a common problem which will soon turn into a common threat which will require a common solution. I just don't see anybody capable of bringing back law and order east of the Dniepr besides Russia. Likewise, since Russia will not agree to carry the full Ukrainian burden by herself, I simply don't see any military forces besides NATO capable of bringing back law and order west of the Dniepr (btw – I use the Dniepr as a convenient conceptual border, but in reality that separation will have to be agreed upon by all parties).

So is the idea of a controlled break-up of the Ukraine a bad one?

Yes, absolutely. It is a terrible one.

But I don't see a better one.

Do you?



# The Ancient Spiritual Roots of Russophobia

November 06, 2016

## Introduction

The term “Russophobia” (the hatred and/or fear of things Russian) has become rather popular in the recent years, courtesy of the anti-Russian hysteria of the AngloZionist Empire, but this is hardly a new concept. In his seminal book “*Russie-Occident – une guerre de mille ans: La russophobie de Charlemagne à la Crise Ukrainienne*” (“The West vs. Russia – a thousand year long war: russophobia from Charlemagne to the Ukrainian Crisis”) which I recently reviewed here:

(<http://thesaker.is/guy-mettans-book-on-russophobia-is-a-must-read-for-any-person-interested-in-russia/>),

Guy Mettan places the roots of russophobia as early as the times of Charlemagne. How could that be? That would mean that russophobia predates the birth of Russia by a full two centuries? And yet, Mettan is correct, although even he does not paint the full picture.

What I propose to do today is not to discuss modern russophobia which has numerous causes and forms, but to look far back into history for the ancient spiritual roots of this relatively modern phenomenon.

My thesis will probably trigger even more condescending smirks, expression of outrage and accusations of bigotry and racism than usual. That is fine. In fact, I will welcome them as a visceral reaction to what I propose to uncover below. One glaring weakness of my argument will be that I won't bother presenting numerous sources as evidence for my assertions. Not only am I not writing an academic paper here, I simply don't have the time and space needed to substantiate all my claims. Still, all the facts and



claims I make below are easily verifiable for anybody with an Internet connection. My goal today is not to convince the naysayers, but to offer a few hopefully useful pointers to those seeking to connect the dots and see the full picture. This being, said, let's now go far back in time.

## **A 2000-year-old dispute**

Those who believe that the Romans crucified Christ better stop reading here and go back to the comfort of ignorance. Those who have actually read the New Testament or, for that matter, the basic Judaic texts on this topic, know that Christ was accused and executed for the crime of blasphemy: He claimed to be the Son of God, the Son of Man (a messianic title), the Messiah announced by the prophets and that He was God: "*Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I AM*" (John 8:58) (this "I AM" is a direct reference to Exodus 3:14). This claim is what split the Jewish people into those who accepted Christ's claims and believed Him and those who did not. What is interesting here is the view which the Jews who did accept Christ had of those Jews who did not. As we all know, Saint John the Theologian wrote the famous words "*I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but are the synagogue of Satan*" (Rev 2:9). And Christ Himself said, "*If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham*" (John 8:39). What we see here is the basis for a claim which was first made in the Apostolic times and which was later fully endorsed and further developed by the Church Fathers: those Jews who rejected Christ thereby lost their "Jewishness" and the "new Jews" are the Christians, regardless of ethnicity, which now have become the new "chosen people". In our modern times of hyper-political correctness and generalized "ecumenical dialogs of love", Christians are mostly ignorant of these facts and, when they are

not, they dare not mention them in public. At a time when Popes declare that Jews are their "older brothers"; that they need not accept Christ, and that Christians and Jews are awaiting the same 2<sup>nd</sup> coming of Christ; saying that Christianity denies Jews their very Jewish identity is definitely "*mauvais ton*". But before the 20<sup>th</sup> century, this Christian claim that modern "Jews" were not really Jews anymore was common knowledge, both amongst Christians and amongst Jews.

[Sidebar: As I explained it in some detail here (<http://thesaker.is/off-topic-but-apparently-needed-judaism-and-christianity-back-to-basics/comment-page-2/>), modern "Judaism" is not the religion of "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" but the religion of Maimonides, Karo and Luria and has its roots in the teachings of the sect of the Pharisees, the Talmud, and the Kabbalah. The closest modern heir to Christ-rejecting Jews of the times of Christ would be the Karaite sect. Modern "Judaism" really ought to be called "Pharisaic Talmudism". For a traditional Patristic look at Pharisaic Talmudism, please see [http://www.preteristarchive.com/ChurchHistory/0386\\_chrysostom\\_adversus-judeaus.html](http://www.preteristarchive.com/ChurchHistory/0386_chrysostom_adversus-judeaus.html) and <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/01281.htm>]

Conversely, Judaic teachings about Christ are not sympathetic either. A quick read of the Toldot Yesh (<http://jewishchristianlit.com//Topics/JewishJesus/toledoth.html>) or, for that matter, the passages about Christ in the Talmud, will convince anyone in need of convincing that the Pharisees' hatred for Christ was not satiated with His crucifixion. And lest anybody

think that this is all racist drivel by blue-eyed Nazis, here is a good article on this topic from Ha'artez corroborating it all.

(<http://www.haaretz.com/jewish/2.209/do-jews-have-a-jesus-problem-1.275951>)

Nowadays an uninformed observer might erroneously conclude that there is a big love-fest between Judaics and Christians, but to the extent that this is true, this is solely due to the fact that most modern Christians and Judaics have long ceased to believe, think and act in accordance with their own traditions. The reality is that for traditional Christians, modern Judaics are fallen, lapsed, people who have failed to live up to their election by God and who now are determined to take by force what had been promised to them by God. For traditional Judaics, Christians are idolaters of the worst kind, as they worship a blaspheming magician, born of a promiscuous hairdresser and a Roman legionnaire, who was justly executed for his crimes and who now forever is confined to hell where he boils in excrements. And lest anybody believe that this hostility is only a matter of a long gone past, I would add that while the Judaics are still waiting for their Messiah, the Christian *consensus Patrum* indicates that this Judaic messiah will be the very same person whom Christ and the Apostles called the Antichrist.

Why does all this matter? It matters because at the very core of it all is the claim that Gentiles have replaced Jews as the chosen people of God; that Christians are the "new Jews", and that modern-day Jews are simply not Jews at all; not only because most of them are more Khazarian than Jewish, but because their faith, traditions, and beliefs are not the ones of the ancient Jewish people as described in the Old Testament. In other words, Christianity says that Jews are not Jews.

## A 1000-year-old dispute

Western history books usually say that Rome was sacked in 410 and fell in 476. The former is true, but the latter is completely false as it conflates the city of Rome and the Roman Empire. Only the city of Rome and the Western Roman Empire came to an end in the 5<sup>th</sup> century, but that very same Roman Empire continued to exist in the East for a full 1000 years (!), until 1453 when the Ottomans finally captured the city of Constantinople. In fact, the imperial capital of the Roman Empire had been moved from Rome to the city of Constantinople, the "New Rome", by Emperor Constantine in 320. Thus, the Rome which, at various times, Visigoths, Vandals, and Ostrogoths sacked was no longer the capital of the Roman Empire.

These two crucial dates, 476 and 1453, are often used to mark the beginning and the end of the Middle-Ages (along with other dates between the 5<sup>th</sup> and the 15<sup>th</sup> century). And since I am setting up the crucial dates for my argument, I will add another one here: 1054, the "official" date for the so-called "Great Schism" between, on one hand, Rome (the city) and, on the other, the other four Patriarchates founded by the Apostles: the Patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople.

At this point, things get complicated and a halfway decent explanation of what really took place would require no less than 100 pages, including a discussion of dogmatic theology, culture, sociology and, of course, politics. The best I can provide at this point are a few bullet-point style sentences summarizing what happened:

The Franks, especially Charlemagne, decided that they would re-create the Roman Empire. To be truly Romans, the Franks also wanted to make their own, original, contribution to Christian theology. They did so by making an addition to the so-called

"Symbol of Faith", or "Credo" in Latin, a text which summarizes the key Christian beliefs. Furthermore, since they were now occupying Rome, the former imperial capital of the Empire, the Franks felt that they were in control of the spiritual capital of the Christian world and that, therefore, the rest of the Christian world ought to accept the primacy of the bishop of Rome – called the "Pope" – and his right to impose a new dogma on the entire Christian world. Following roughly 200 years of tensions between the (Frankish-occupied) Rome and the (still free) Eastern Roman Empire, the final separation took place in 1054 when the Pope excommunicated the Patriarch of Constantinople who then returned him the favor. What is important for our purposes is this: not only did the Frankish invasion of Rome mark the end of the Roman civilization in the West, it also cut-off the western world from the Roman Empire which continued to exist for another ten centuries. The process of severance between the two parts of the Empire began in the 5<sup>th</sup> century following the fall of the city of Rome and continued throughout the following centuries. During the 10<sup>th</sup> century, Rome suffered during the so-called dark ages (*saeculum obscurum*) and the so-called "Rule of the Harlots" (*pornokratia*). At a time when the Roman Empire in the east was almost at the apex of its glory, the Franks were indulging in an orgy of destruction and corruption which completely changed the face of the western part of the European continent and completely severed the vital cultural and spiritual ties which had kept the Roman Empire together in the past centuries.

During the following 1000 years, while the Roman Empire continued its existence in the East, the European Middle-Ages slowly and painfully gave birth to a new civilization, the West European civilization, which really took its first mature shape during the Renaissance with its re-discovery of the ancient Greek and Roman world. Whatever form this so-called "re-discovery"

took, it is a fact that the 1000 years of the Middle-Ages separate modern western civilization from the Roman civilization and that modern Europe was born not of the Romans, but of the Franks. The (Orthodox) East, however, has never known any “Middle-Ages” and has maintained a cultural and religious continuity to the ancient Christian world and the Roman Empire.

In the West, the so-called "Roman Catholic Church" (another misnomer – there is nothing Roman or "Catholic" – meaning "universal" – about the Papacy as it is Frankish and local) likes to present itself as the original Church whose roots and traditions go back to the Apostolic times. This is simply false. The reality is that the religion which calls itself "Roman Catholic" is a relatively new religion, younger than Islam by several centuries, which was born in the 11<sup>th</sup> century of a rejection of the key tenets of the 1000 year long Christian faith. Furthermore, from the moment of its birth, this religion has embarked on an endless cycle of innovations including the 19<sup>th</sup> century (!) dogmas of the Papal infallibility and the Immaculate Conception. Far from being conservative or traditionalists, the Latins have always been rabid innovators and modernists.

Nowadays there are many Christian denominations out there, but only the Orthodox Churches can testify to the fact that the Frankish local Church is neither Roman, nor Catholic; that its roots are not in the Apostolic times, but in the (dark) Middle-Ages and that far from being a heir to the 2000 year old faith “*which the Lord gave, was preached by the Apostles, and was preserved by the Fathers*” to use the words of Saint Athanasios, the Latin faith is nothing but a collection of deviations from the original Christian faith.

## The feared and hated witness

Now we see a pattern here. Both for the Judaics and for the Latins, the Orthodox Christians are the only witnesses out there who can (and do!) openly challenge not only their legitimacy but their very identity. From an Orthodox perspective (and here I am referring to the traditional, Patristic, point of view) ***modern Jews are not Jews and the Catholics are not catholic***. In both cases, we are dealing with very successful frauds, but frauds nonetheless. Orthodox Christians believe that they, and they alone, are both the real Jews and the real Catholics. Modern Jews are nothing but Pharisees while Latins are simply heretics. Jews were called to be the Chosen People while Rome used to be recognized as the “first amongst equals” by the other Patriarchates. Alas, in both cases a tragic fall from grace occurred in a manner reminiscent of Lucifer’s fall from Heaven (“*How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!*” Isa 14:12). And to those who would say that such a claim is preposterous, Orthodox Christians would simply point at the immense corpus of Patristic writings which have always supported that claim. The only option for somebody rejecting this claim is to reject Christianity itself.

My argument here is not a historical or theological one. Regardless of whether one accepts or not the Orthodox view of modern “Judaism” and “Roman Catholicism” – it is certain that both Judaic and Latin were quite aware of this view (there were plenty of polemical texts written over the centuries by all sides to this dispute) and that this challenge to their very legitimacy and identity was perceived as a monumental affront and, when supported by an immense and powerful empire like the Russian one, a mortal enemy which had to be either conquered or eliminated.

[Sidebar: Islam. It is interesting to note here that Orthodox Christianity, which Muslims called “Rum” as in Rome, in no way challenges the legitimacy or identity of Islam. While Islam and Christianity have plenty of irreconcilable theological differences, Muslims do not claim to be Jews or Christians. As for Orthodox Christians, they obviously do not claim to be the true or original, Muslims. Thus the co-existence of these two religions is not logically mutually exclusive even if their theologies are fundamentally incompatible].

## **The modern dispute**

It would be ridiculous to claim that the root cause(s) of modern fear and/or hate of things Russian can all be explained by ancient theological arguments. In reality, neither Russia nor the West are all that religious nowadays. And while there is definitely a religious rebirth taking place in Russia, it remains also true that only a minority of Russians are truly religious or well-versed in Orthodox theology. Furthermore, there are plenty of reasons why some hate/fear Russia which have absolutely nothing to do with religion, including the fact that Russia is, and has always been, an unconquered military superpower, that the Soviet regime has oppressed millions of people in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union, and that any more or less sovereign and independent regime in Russia stands as the main obstacle for the West to take control of Russia's immense resources, and many other reasons. As for (truly religious) Judaics and Latins, they are a small minority compared to the vast majority of largely agnostic people around them. In reality, modern Russophobia has numerous independent



“vectors” all contributing to a grand “sum vector” expressed in the West’s current policies towards Russia. And yet...

Regardless of the actual level of religiosity in Russia, Russia remains the objective historical and cultural heir to the Roman Empire: the First Rome fell in 476, the Second Rome fell in 1453 while the Third Rome fell in 1917.

[Sidebar: A Fourth Rome cannot happen simply because, unlike what happened with the First and Second Rome, the Third one could not "pass on" its role to a hypothetical Fourth one. Seventy years of Communist rule will forever remain an insurmountable barrier between Russia, the Third Rome, and modern Russia and no true succession is now possible]

To ignore the historical importance of a Christian Roman civilization which lasted from the 4<sup>th</sup> to the 20<sup>th</sup> century would be a major oversight. Those 16 centuries have had a huge impact on the Russian culture, even upon those Russians who are only superficially religious or outright agnostic, and it still can be felt today. The same is true for what is called the “West” nowadays: what is the AngloZionist Empire if not the cultural continuation of the British Empire with the Zionist (and, thus, Judaic) element recently added to it? (<http://www.haaretz.com/world-news/u-s-election-2016/1.749443>) And don't let the fact that Protestants and Anglicans are not "Roman Catholics" distract you from the reality that Protestantism itself is just the offspring from the spiritual intercourse between its Latin and Judaic parents, just as Freemasonry – the dominant ideology and worldview today – is the offspring resulting from the spiritual intercourse between Protestantism and Pharisaic Judaism. Whether we are aware of it

or not, we live in “civilizational realms” which have ancient roots and our worldview and outlook on life are often shaped by a past which we often know very little about.

## Conclusion

There is a clash of civilizations taking place. It does not primarily oppose a putative “Christian West” to Islam. For one thing, the modern “West” has long ceased to be Christian and should now be categorized as post-Christian. Furthermore, the Muslim world is not united and does not have the resources to meaningfully oppose the AngloZionist Empire. Until China or Latin America or some other civilization truly rises up to be able to challenge the current world order, Russia is the only country which will dare to openly challenge the very legitimacy of the western political system and the ideology it has been built upon. Modern Russia is both capable and willing to challenge the dominant western ideology (from Capitalism to the belief that homosexuality is a normal and healthy variation of human sexuality)

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homosexuality\\_and\\_psychology](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homosexuality_and_psychology))

*precisely* because of her position as the heir to, and continuator of, the Christian Roman Empire. True, for the past 300 years or so, Russia has been ruled by a generally westernized ruling elite, but that elite itself has always remained a foreign superstructure imposed upon the Russian nation which never truly identified with it. With Putin, Russia has finally found a leader who does not represent the interests of the elites, but rather the interests of the vast majority of the population – hence Putin's stratospheric popularity ratings. And that too frightens the West, especially the western elites who now feel that their rule is threatened by a nuclear superpower which is determined not to let them take over our entire planet. It is impossible to predict what will happen next.

But it does appear likely to me that this ancient conflict between two fundamentally opposed spiritualities and civilizations will come to some kind of a resolution, for better or for worse, in the near future.



## 2016: the year of Russia's triumph

December 28, 2016

Just like European maps place Europe in the center of the planet, so do most western commentators look at the past year from a US/Europe-centered perspective. Which is fair enough. Furthermore, the AngloZionist Empire has just suffered two major disasters, the Brexit and the election of Trump, so there is truly much interesting to focus on. Still, what I want to do today is to look at the year which is ending from a Russian perspective. The following were the major challenges Russia faced in 2016:

1. The Nazi regime in Kiev
2. The civil war in the Donbass
3. Ukrainian attempts to blockade Crimea
4. The rabid hostility of the US Administration
5. NATO's policy of military confrontation in Europe
6. The united European front against Russia
7. Western sanctions, the subsequent drop in investments and credit, and the low oil prices
8. The growing dissatisfaction of the Russian people with the economic policies of the government
9. The struggle against the "liberal" 5th column inside Russia
10. The international aggression against Syria
11. The demonization of Russia in general and of Vladimir Putin in particular
12. Terrorist attacks against Russia

Let's take these one by one now and **score them**:

## The Ukraine; score 5/5

The Nazi-occupied Ukraine is in free fall. In fact, it has been in free fall for a while already, but just like somebody jumping from the 40th floor of a building is doing "okay" passing by the 20th floor, so did the Ukraine still have the possibility to say "so far so good" and look halfway credible to the superficially informed. Now, however, it is becoming rather obvious that the so-called "Revolution of Dignity" (which is how the Neonazis call the coup against Yanukovich) is an abject failure and that the "Independent Ukraine" is simply beyond rescue. The ruling class which came to power now is falling apart, everybody is fighting everybody else and there is no other discernible policy left beyond personal enrichment and survival. As for the "Joan of Arc of the Ukraine" and "Hope of the Ukraine" – Nadezhda Savchenko – she is now denounced as a traitor and FSB agent. Forbes is now running an article entitled "Corruption is killing Ukraine's economy" (<http://www.forbes.com/sites/kenrapoza/2016/10/14/how-corruption-corrodes-ukraines-economy/#63f7567f67cf>) while a former Ukrainian lawmaker has passed recordings of Poroshenko taking bribes to the FBI (<https://www.kyivpost.com/ukraine-politics/fugitive-lawmaker-gives-fbi-recordings-poroshenko.html>). As for the Ukrainian military, which Poroshenko has recently advertised as one of the 5 best in the world, it has only mustered enough forces to send one company-size infantry force supported by 2 tank platoons to attack the Novorussian positions near Debaltsevo before getting them all killed. The situation of the Ukrainian military is so bad that they are now forced to use private cars to get to the frontlines and to evacuate the wounded. Yes, on paper the Ukrainian military is huge, but in reality, it is a force which has a hard time surviving even before going into battle. Last but not least, the entire Nazi

ruling elite has thrown its full political weight behind Hillary while pouring scorn and vitriol against Trump. To say that they are now screwed would be an understatement. Hence the wind of utter panic now taking over Kiev.

### **The Donbass; score 3/5**

The Russian policy in the Donbass (non-occupation combined with overt and covert support) was clearly the correct one: the DNR and LNR are getting stronger while the Nazi-occupied Ukraine is going down the tubes, *vide supra*, as they say. There have however also been clear failures and the two main ones are the Russian inability to stop the constant shelling and attacks on civilians from the Nazis, and the Russian failure to establish security inside the two republics. If the first failure can be excused (there is no magic recipe to make that happen), the second one is inexcusable as seen by the murder of several key Novorussian figures. Furthermore, the situation in the Donbass remains very difficult and potentially dangerous. In the big scheme of things, Russia did very well, but as soon as you look down to the more detailed level many mistakes and failures become apparent. Still, it is now obvious to any decently informed person that time is now (and has always been, really) on the side of the Novorussians as every passing day makes them stronger and the Ukronazis weaker.

### **Crimea; score 5/5**

The Ukronazis tried everything, from blockading the peninsula, to cutting off water and electricity, to sending terrorist infiltrators. This gave Russia the opportunity to “save” Crimea from the Ukraine over and over and over again. It is pretty darn clear that the Ukronazis have long ago given up ever getting back

Crimea and that all that is left to them are mostly ineffective ways to try to make the people of Crimea miserable, thereby, of course, only strengthening their resolve. Initially, there were some people in Crimea who were not quite convinced that the nightmare was really over and that Russia truly meant business (especially with all the rumors about "Putin selling out"). But now that the Russians have to put major efforts in shielding Crimea from the Ukronazi attempts at blockading them, those doubts have disappeared. Crimea's future looks extremely bright: not only is the Russian state pouring in billions of Rubles for huge infrastructural improvement and the deployment of a very large and advanced military force, but the prospects for tourism and trade are also excellent.

### **The United States; score 5/5**

The credit for the election of Donald Trump goes first and foremost to the American people to whom I sincerely believe the entire planet owe a heartfelt and loud "THANK YOU!!!!!" I will never be able to prove that and, thank God, we will never know if I was right, but up to the last minute, I was convinced that there was a very strong probability that Hillary in the White House would have meant war, probably nuclear, with Russia. I am still undecided about Trump, but I view his upcoming term with cautious optimism and while I would never say never, I really very strongly feel that with Trump in the White House the risks of war with Russia have fallen to a dramatically low level and that, barring some stunning provocation or disaster, a war between the USA and Russia has now become exceedingly unlikely. Glory be to God for His immense mercy towards us!

That being said, I will dare to speculate that Russia did play a role in the election of Trump. No, not by hacking emails or by

recruiting Ron Paul (!!!) as an agent of Russian propaganda, but by openly and firmly confronting the USA on all fronts and showing that Russia would not bend her knee before the AngloZionist Empire. As I have written many times, Russia has been preparing for war for years now and while Russians were (and still are) afraid of war, they are also ready and willing to fight if forced to do so. In his latest press conference

(<http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/53573>) Putin specifically referred to the will of the Russian people as a key element in Russia's ability to defeat any aggressor when he said:

*“We are stronger than any potential aggressor. I have no problem repeating it. I also said why we are stronger. This has to do with the effort to modernize the Russian Armed Forces, as well as the history and geography of our country, and **the current state of Russian society**”*

And he is absolutely right. Sure, Hillary was probably stupid enough to try to impose a no-fly zone over Syria, but the 200 or so generals and admirals who expressed their support for Trump probably understood what that kind of folly would entail. Furthermore, it appears that quite a few Americans are sympathetic to Russia and Putin himself. Again, in his latest press conference Putin referred to this and made some very interesting comments:

*“I do not take support for the Russian President among a large part of Republican voters as support for me personally, but rather see it in this case as an indication that **a substantial part of the American people share similar views with us***



*on the world's organization, what we ought to be doing, and the common threats and challenges we are facing. It is good that there are people who sympathize with our views on traditional values because this forms a good foundation on which to build relations between two such powerful countries as Russia and the United States, build them on the basis of our peoples' mutual sympathy. (...) It seems to me that Reagan would be happy to see his party's people winning everywhere, and would welcome the victory of the newly elected President so adept at catching the public mood, and who took precisely this direction and pressed onwards to the very end, even when no one except us believed he could win."*

Putin puts it down to values, common values, between the Russian and the American people.

[Personal sidebar: For whatever this is worth, I regularly interact with Americans who support Putin on the grounds that "he stands for American values unlike the SOBs in Washington"].

But how did the Americans become aware of what values Putin and Russia stood for if not for the ceaseless efforts of Putin himself and the alternative media to convey these values to the general public? I think that by OPENLY denouncing the total hypocrisy of the AngloZionist Empire and by OPENLY offering a different civilizational model, Putin and Russia did have an impact on the public opinion in the West. To put it simply: Russia has

scored an ideological victory over the AngloZionist imperialists. In other words, the Russian policy of standing firm against the Empire while openly challenging it on its ideological foundation was the correct one and it probably did have an impact on the outcome of the election in the USA.

## **NATO; score 4/5**

Russia has defeated NATO on two levels: a purely military one and a political one. On the military level Russia has taken all the asymmetrical measures she promised to negate both the US anti-missile system in Europe and the deployment of threatening military power in Eastern Europe: Russia deployed the Iskander missile, doubled the size of her Airborne Forces, and initiated the creation of a Tank Army in the western strategic direction (to read more about how Russia prepared to fight and defeat NATO see "How Russia is preparing for WWII" (<http://thesaker.is/how-russia-is-preparing-for-wwiii/>) and "The EU's suicide by reality denial" (<http://thesaker.is/the-eus-suicide-by-reality-denial/>)). On the political level, there can be little doubt that all the European leaders who favored confrontation with Russia are now unpopular and in a political crisis except maybe Merkel, but Germany alone can't do anything meaningful (at least one "positive" side effect, so to speak, of the EU integration). As for the election of Trump, it has resulted in a NATO-wide panic, especially in those countries which had prostituted themselves to the Empire with special enthusiasm and zeal (Poland, the three Baltic statelets, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, and our "Orthodox brothers" in Romania and Bulgaria). I don't see Trump dumping NATO, there would be too much opposition against that, but with Trump in the White House all the nonsense about the "Russian bear is about to invade Latvia or Poland" is going to come to a crashing end and the poor folks in

eastern Europe will come to realize that neither Russia nor the USA gives a damn about them. Trump will probably put the financial squeeze on NATO and force its member states to purchase even more US gear, but that will be a purely financial operation and not an attempt at surrounding Russia with military forces. Russia's ultimate goal, the replacement of NATO by a European-wide common defense agreement from Portugal to the Urals has not happened, but the election of Trump is a huge step in the right direction.

### **The EU; score 5/5**

Poor “EUans” (my own word for the European zombies who believed in the Bilderberger’s European Union): they are now, how shall I put it politely, totally “frigged”? Not only did the British people defy the Empire and vote for a Brexit, but now the Imperial Homeland had “backstabbed” them by electing a patriot who is not interested in maintaining the global empire (or so he says, at least for the time being). At the same time, the so-called “refugee crisis” is bringing several crucial EU nations to the brink of a civil war (France for example) while all the efforts of the elites to blame Russia for it all end up in abject failures. Just check out this hilarious article in the British Sun which accuses Russia of, I kid you not, “organizing sex attacks in Germany“!! (<https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/2400317/russia-may-organise-migrant-sex-attacks-in-europe-to-make-angela-merkel-lose-german-elections-eu-experts-claim/>) True, we already had the “Serbian Chetniks using rape as a weapon of ethnic cleansing” and “Gaddafi distributing Viagra to his soldiers to rape opposition supporters” but Putin ordering refugees to rape women in Germany is the best, so to speak. And just in case the unthinkable happens in Germany, the Germans have already warned that

Russian hackers might steal the election in Germany. If this was not so utterly disgusting it would be hilarious. The bottom line is this: the entire EU project is morally completely bankrupt. Each EU member state is now in a deep political crisis and the so-called "elites" are scrambling to find a response to what appears to be an inevitable collapse of the EU-order over Europe. The European militaries are a joke, all of them, and when, say, the Swedes go on "Russian sub hunting" they always end up embarrassing themselves. If there are any extra-terrestrials observing us from space, the EU is beyond any doubt their laughing stock. As for the Russians, far from fearing the Europeans, they don't even take them very seriously and they look at them with either pity or scorn for their apparently infinite lack of spine and dignity. And sure, as soon as mentally sane leaders return to power in the various EU countries Russia will be more than happy to trade with the EU, send and receive tourists and generally have friendly relations. But after over three centuries of trying to sheepishly imitate the Europeans and be accepted as European themselves, the Russians have finally lost all interest in emulating Europe, at least in a cultural or political way. Of course, the Russians will still love German cars, French wines or Italian music, but the myth of the European cultural superiority has truly died. Good riddance!

### **The Russian economy; score 3/5**

The main external factors influencing the Russian economy have been Western sanctions, the subsequent drop in investments and credit and, especially, the low oil prices. Almost exactly as Putin had predicted it, it took Russia two years to overcome the combined effect of these factors, so says not me or a Kremlin spokesman, but the IMF (see <http://thesaker.is/the-imf-admits-that-russia-has-survived-both-the-drop-in-oil-prices-and-the->

sanctions-and-is-on-the-path-of-recovery/). What matters here is not this or that figure for GDP or inflation, but the fact that all the key indicators for the Russian economy point to a gradual recovery and good prospects for growth. I personally think that the policies of the “economic block” of the Medvedev government made the effects of this crisis even worse than they had to be, but I have to admit that despite the major mistakes committed by the Russian government, the Russian economy is recovering. If I had to score the performance of the Russian government's policies I would have given it a maximum of 2/5, but since what I am looking at is the state of the economy I have to give it an objective 3/5. I just think that a 5/5 would have been possible. One small point here: some have made a great deal of noise around the planned reduction in Russian defense spending but what they are missing is that that reduction has been made possible by the spending over the past couple of years and that the Russian defense program by 2020 has not been in any way amended, never mind reduced. In other words, the Russian military can afford to use less money for a couple of years and there will be no cuts in defense programs as planned by 2020.

### **The Russian public opinion; score 4/5**

In spite of the still strong grip the "IMF-types" in the Russian government have over the key economic decisions in Russia there are some signs that things are getting better and that the Russian public is getting some of the heads it wanted to see roll: here I am, of course, referring to the arrest of the Minister of Economic Development of the Russian Federation Alexei Uliukaev. Of course, the list of candidates for termination and arrest is much longer (see <http://thesaker.is/putins-biggest-failure/>) but Uliukaev was definitely one of the most influential and toxic members of the

Atlantic Integrationists and the hysterical reaction of the Russian liberal press clearly shows how painful this arrest is for the Russian 5th column. As for right now, the arrest of Uliukaev has not been followed by more sackings or arrests, but it is quite possible that Putin did with Uliukaev what he already did with Berezovsky: hit at the one “big guy” and therefore force the rest of his gang to play ball and give up any hopes of confronting him. Only time will tell if sacking and arresting Uliukaev will be enough to finally re-sovereignize Russia, but it sure is a very good beginning.

### **Russian Russophobes; score 4/5**

Sounds weird, does it not? “Russian Russophobes”. Reminds me of the “self-hating Jew” category. And yet they exist, at least nominally. I say nominally because being Russian has never been about speaking Russian, or about living in Russia or even about some hypothetical “Russian ethnicity” (which really does not exist). One definition of what it is to be Russian was given by the philosopher Vasilii Rozanov who wrote the following prophetic words in 1913

:

*“To love a happy and great Motherland is really not a big thing. We have to love her when she is weak, small, humiliated, finally, stupid, finally, even filled with vices. It is when our “mother” is drunk, lying and all entangled in her sins that we must not depart from her. But even that is not enough: when she finally dies, eaten up by Jews, and when only her bones remain – he will be truly “Russian” who will weep over her useless skeleton, abandoned by all. He truly shall be... “.*

Needless to say, Rozanov is hated by the Russian “liberals”. Contrary to Rozanov, these Russophobic “liberals” rejoice in every Russian failure and they can barely contain their joy when some tragedy befalls the Russian people which they hate and despise for supporting a “tyrant” like Putin instead of them, the self-perceived “intellectual elites” of Russia.

When Putin came to power, these 5th Russophobic columnists were literally everywhere since their families were usually members of the Soviet elites and since during the infamous 1990s they literally took control of every single lever of power in Russia from the mass media to the Kremlin. First, Putin got rid of the oligarchs, especially the “Seven Bankers“

(<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Semibankirschina>).

Next, he gradually pushed most of them out of the mass media (that is; when their colleagues and patrons in the West began speaking of the lack of a free press in Russia). And then he began the slow and outright dangerous process of getting rid of them, one by one, from inside the Russian government, including the Kremlin. But Putin's biggest achievement this year has to be his extremely successful campaign to delegitimize this 5th column. He did that not by “cracking down” on them, nor did he murder any journalist or opposition figure, and he did not fill the “new Russian Gulag” with thousands of liberal dissidents. He (by “he” I mean not only Putin himself, but also his supporters) did the exact opposite: he gave them a platform and he made darn sure that their views would be freely aired on an almost daily basis. Those interested about this can read my analysis “Counter-propaganda, Russian style“; (<http://thesaker.is/counter-propaganda-russian-style/>). This was pure genius: instead of silencing the Russophobes, Putin gave them a completely disproportionate amount of airtime (keep in mind that less than 5% of the Russian population supports these freaks) and let them hang themselves by being wrong on just about

everything: they were wrong on Crimea, wrong on the Ukraine, wrong on the economy, wrong on social and civil rights, wrong on corruption, wrong on so-called “gay rights”, wrong about NATO, wrong about the EU, wrong about Clinton (they loved her), wrong about Trump (they hate him), wrong about terrorism and wrong about Syria. As a result, these “liberals” (in the Russian meaning of the word) are now universally seen as traitors, Russophobes, snobs, racists, 5th columnists, CIA puppets, etc. They now are absolutely hated and desperate. As a result, during the recent elections, we saw the amazing sight of Russian “liberals”, including Jews, allying themselves with Nazi

(<http://maysuryan.livejournal.com/437587.html>)

and organizing joint protests against Putin

(<http://russianpulse.ru/continentalist/2016/09/14/1567813-parnas-i-natsionalisty>).

Needless to say, that only served to further discredit them.

There are still plenty of 5th columnists in Russia, but they are mostly laying really low, hoping for better times and trying to remain out of the public eye as much as possible. Their main remaining center of power is the Russian Central Bank and the “economic bloc” of the Medvedev government. But since both Kudrin and Uliukaev have been kicked out, the rest of them are being very careful in their actions and statements.

All in all, 2016 has been an absolutely catastrophic year for the Russophobic 5th column which is now in a state of total despair and which seems to have no future whatsoever.

## **Syria; score 5/5**

Russia's success in Syria is nothing short of amazing. Not only did an extremely small Russian military force succeed in turning around the course of the war, but it has held an essentially



indefensible position long enough to deter Turkey, Saudi Arabia, the Gulf states and the USA from overtly attacking the Syrian forces or government. The Russians succeeded in this despite numerous, ugly and bloody provocations and despite having to operate in an extremely hostile environment (the region "belongs" to NATO and CENTCOM). One of the most amazing successes was how the Russians managed to save Erdogan *in extremis* from the US-backed coup and convince him to work with Russia and Iran to solve the Syrian crisis. The liberation of Aleppo could not have happened had Turkey continued to support Al-Nusra & Co. at any price. At the very least it would have taken much more time. By the end of 2016, the Russians owned the Black Sea, controlling, at least for the time being, the eastern Mediterranean and they are working with the three biggest powers on the ground: the Syrians, of course, but also Iran and Turkey. As for the United States, they seemed to have lost the entire region and their only "achievement", so to speak, has been to alienate both the Israelis and the Saudis. As for President-elect Trump, he has clearly indicated that his number one priority will be to smash Daesh & Co. which happens to be exactly what Russia, Iran, and Syria want too. If Trump really manages to kick the Neocon crazies to the cockroach-filled basement where they belong, we could see something quite amazing happening: a joint Russian-US effort to destroy Daesh. The big problem here will be the totally counter-productive and, frankly, idiotic anti-Iranian rhetoric of the Trump campaign. However, there must be enough good brains around Trump to make him understand that nothing in the region can happen without Iran's approval and that the US and Iran don't need to love each other to agree on a common objective. Trump strikes me as a realist much more than as an ideologue. Hopefully, he will learn how to separate AIPAC-pleasing rhetoric from serious

foreign policy; (the crash of the Obama Administration ought to teach him that lesson).

What is certain is that Russia is now running the show in Syria and that without US or Turkish support, Daesh will be facing an existential crisis. Of course, the situation remains fluid, complex and dangerous. And I would never put it past the US or Turkey to do yet another 180 and to resume their support for Daesh. The Kurdish factor, Israeli policies, and Erdogan's inherent unpredictability all serve to make sure that the Syrian crisis will continue well into 2017. However, I think that the Neocon's crazy rampage has reached its apogee and that things should begin to improve from now on. Russia alone simply could not save Syria, and yet she appears to have done just that.

### **The Russophobic hysteria in the West; score 3/5**

There was simply no way that the AngloZionists could be defeated on all fronts without screaming "*oy veh!*" to high heaven and screaming they did. All year long. Their allegations ranged from Russia wanting to invade Latvia to Russian hackers stealing the US election. And to make absolutely sure that there was no doubt at all as to the identity of these hackers, the AngloZionists informed us that these hackers called themselves "fancy bear" and "cozy bear", that they used the alias "Felix Edmundovich" (the first name and patronymic of Felix Derzhinskii, the founder of the Soviet secret services) and that they worked during Moscow time office hours and they took breaks during Russian holidays. And lest you think that this kind of nonsense was made up in a mental institution or a kindergarten, here is the link to the article in the New York Times quoting "security experts":

<http://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/27/world/europe/russia-dnc-hack-emails.html>.

Amazing, no? But then again, when I see the Neocons seriously calling Ron Paul a Russian agent I realize that there is nothing, no matter how stupid, that these guys would not dare say. *Chutzpah* in action, I suppose. And while the left side of the Bell Curve appears to have fully internalized the message, there is a growing segment of the population which realizes how silly all these accusations are.

[Personal Sidebar: While I am sure that there are some Americans who believe that the Russkies are a dangerous enemy of the USA, I have yet to meet even one such American. In my day to day interactions, I see \*no\* hostility towards Russians even when I openly speak Russian with my family in stores or restaurants or when I say that I am Russian. Maybe this is because I am in Florida and not New York, but I have yet to see a single example of anti-Russian hostility].

The Russian treatment by the Western-controlled World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) at the Rio Olympics was an absolute outrage, a farce and crime all wrapped into one. And Russia is very much to blame for having allowed the key world organizations to become so controlled by the West. However, let's also see that the USA failed to have Russia completely banned from Rio and that Russian hackers (yes, they do exist) have uncovered convincing evidence which discredits WADA and the entire system behind it. I would call that "growing pains" for the post-Soviet Russian sport: Russia now needs to "clean house" in the very real cases of doping while, at the same time, wrestling the control of the key international organizations from the West. A tough task for sure, but Russia has an immensely powerful ally in this (and many

other) struggles: China. But yes, all in all, the partial ban and subsequent Russia-bashing campaign is a black eye for Russia.

In the case of Europe, Russophobia has always been a northern European thing. Mediterranean countries were only dragged into imposing sanctions under very strong pressure from the north. It now appears that France will soon be ruled either by one or the other generally pro-Russian parties which are competing for the Presidency. The Brexit took out probably the single most anti-Russian country in the EU and now Germany and Poland are more or less on their own trying to desperately revitalize the anti-Russian front. The problem for them is that they are also both subservient US colonies and that while they can fancy themselves the next in line to defend the western civilization against the revanchist Mongol hordes from the East, the reality is that they will do whatever the hell Uncle Sam tells them to do.

From now on, the only bastion of true rabid Russophobia will remain in the most thoroughly “Zionified” segment of society: the media, the so-called “intellectuals”, the “liberal interventionists” and all the “tribe of minorities” who have a beef with Russia on account of the different civilizational model she represents (gender differentiated parents, religion, patriotism (but not nationalism!), etc.). These will continue to pour a steady stream of filth against Russia in general and Putin in particular. Putin will not be their only target, however, and Donald Trump will be the recipient of whatever hatred remains after Putin. Frankly, taking on Putin AND Trump at the same time is a futile and possibly risky business, no matter who you are in the AngloZionist “jet set”, especially when you also have little traction with the general public whom you have regularly insulted, demeaned and dismissed.

There could be a gigantic return of the pendulum happening before our eyes against those who have produced the lion's share of the hate-propaganda in the West: these guys might well end up finally reaping what they have sown and become the object of hate themselves.

### **Terrorism; score 4/5**

This year has been tough on Russia. A recent anonymous comment posted on this blog: <http://thesaker.is/the-disaster-of-the-russian-military-tu-154-a-few-short-first-thoughts/#comment-307407>, made a good list of the tragic murder of Russians this year including the bombing of the Russian civilian airliner over Egypt, the Su-24 shoot down involving US AWACS, the murder of the Russian medics in a precision strike, the murder of the Russian Ambassador and the probable murder of the Red Army Choir (the latest news out of Russia seems to point with a malfunction of the wing flaps, not a terrorist attack). To this list, I would add the Novo Russian commanders assassinated in the Donbass. That is a lot of innocent Russian victims. But compared to the number of innocent Syrians or Turks this number is relatively small. It is outright tiny compared to the kind of mass horror the Wahabis managed to organize in Chechnia. Let's remember that Russia is a country at war with state-sponsored transnational terrorism and that many millions of dollars of "aid" are going towards the various Nazi and Wahabi organizations that have the murder of Russians as their main goal. I would say "so far, so good" but I cannot do that because I believe that Russia is still not ready to face the kind of terrorism which is likely to hit her in the next year. There is one specific type of target which is currently completely undefended and which the terrorists can strike with quasi-impunity: Russian Orthodox churches outside Russia.

The Russians need to revisit the kind of terror campaign the Palestinians waged in the 1970s against the Israelis when they attacked not only Israeli cultural centers, but also Jewish daycare centers, schools, and synagogues. Russian Orthodox churches are now facing the very same threat including bombings and hostage taking. As somebody who has attended Russian Orthodox churches all my life and all over the planet I know that the number of potential targets are in the \*hundreds\* and that they are all completely unprotected.

The Israeli example is crucial here because the Israelis rapidly realized that they simply could not count on the local police forces to protect them. This is why they organized various local organizations directly attached to a synagogue or school staffed by volunteers who could do many very useful and fully legal things to protect Israeli/Jewish targets such as, for example, begin to occupy all the parking spaces around a synagogue 48 hours before any religious holiday to make sure that no VBIEDs (aka "car bombs") could be placed next to the synagogue. There is \*a lot\* a well-educated group of volunteers can do to legally protect an exposed civilian target. They can do even better when they work with local cops and the security specialists at the embassy. The Russians urgently need to study the Israeli experience in dealing with a kind of threat which they will soon face. Remember, the Palestinians also began by attacking diplomats, officials, and aircraft, but as soon as these targets were "hardened" they turned to daycare centers, schools, and synagogues.

I believe that inside Russia the FSB has a good control of the situation. But outside Russia, the amount of specialized personnel fully dedicated to security is woefully inadequate and needs to be dramatically expanded. During the Soviet era, few governments dared to openly attack Soviet targets, the fearsome (and very much exaggerated!) reputation of the KGB probably helped, while during

the Yeltsin years there really was no point in attacking Russia as she was internally collapsing. But now that Russia is very strong internally, and the Russian military personnel hard to get at, diplomats, children, and clergy are probably going to be the next targets of the Wahabis.

The one good news about this issue is that the Soviets/Russians have been fighting the Wahabis since the 1970s and that they are acutely aware that there is no such thing as non-state sponsored terrorism. The Russians know where the money, training, and weapons come from and they know that terrorism can only be defeated by strong counter-intelligence and intelligence operations, especially human intelligence. The foreign intelligence branch of the KGB, the PGU or First Chief Directorate, had a (very much deserved) reputation for being able to infiltrate agents pretty much anywhere, including the top echelons of the CIA and NSA, and we can be confident that the SVR today is slowly rebuilding its capabilities worldwide and, especially, in the countries which sponsor Wahabi terrorism. Just the way the Russian special services saved Erdogan and thereby “flipped” Turkey – one of the absolutely worst sponsors of Wahabi terrorism – is already a huge success. God willing, the Saudis will be next.

## **Conclusion**

Simply put – 2016 has been a fantastic year for Russia. Putin’s policy of slow, low-key and deliberate move and counter-move has proven to be extremely effective. While to some “hurray patriots” it did appear that Putin was being passive and doing nothing, the outcome of this year has been a Putin victory on all fronts, including the most dangerous and difficult ones. Remember all the nonsense these Putin-haters wrote about “Putin selling out the Donbass”, “Putin unable to reply to the Turkish shoot-down of the

SU-24", "Putin disarming Syria" or "Putin betraying Assad"? These "hurray patriots" have been predicting doom and gloom for years now and they have been proven wrong every single time. Did that silence them? Somewhat. I notice that most of the "Putin is selling out the Donbass" blogs are posting very little and when they do, it is mostly stuff unrelated to their previous Putin-bashing campaign. The same goes for the Ukronazi commentators on sites which allow them to post: they seem to have thrown in the towel and given up convincing the world about how democratic the junta in Kiev is, about how there are hundreds of Russian tanks in Donetsk and how the Ukraine will join the EU and become Germany-like overnight. The only ones who are keeping up the Putin-bashing campaign are the western prostitutes, but they are doing that for pay and to keep their jobs. Besides, that is all they know how to do anyway. But all in all, there is a general lack of energy and enthusiasm in the Russia-hating camp which is a real joy for me to see.

2017 could be an amazing year for the world, or it could be a big disappointment. Right now this depends mostly on what Trump will do after he assumes his official capacity. To me, the single most important fact will remain that with Hillary in the White House our planet risked a major thermonuclear war. There is no reason any more to believe that this is going to happen. As for the list of all the good things which \*could\* happen in 2017 if Trump does the right thing for his country, it will be the topic of a future analysis.





## The Best Armed Forces on the Planet?

January 18, 2017

In my recent article “Risks and Opportunities for 2017” (<http://thesaker.is/risks-and-opportunities-for-2017/>) I made a statement which shocked many readers. I wrote:

*“Russia is now the most powerful country on the planet. (...) the Russian armed forces are probably the most powerful and capable ones on earth (albeit not the largest ones) (...) Russia is the most powerful country on earth because of two things: Russia openly rejects and denounces the worldwide political, economic and ideological system the USA has imposed upon our planet since WWII and because Vladimir Putin enjoys the rock-solid support of about 80%+ of the Russian population. The biggest strength of Russia in 2017 is a moral and a political one, it is the strength of a civilization which refuses to play by the rules which the West has successfully imposed on the rest of mankind. And now that Russia has successfully “pushed back” others will inevitably follow (again, especially in Asia).”*

While some dismissed this as a ridiculous hyperbole, others have asked me to explain how I came to that conclusion. I have to admit that this paragraph is somewhat ambiguous: first I make a specific claim about the capabilities of the Russian military, and then the "evidence" that I present is of a moral and political nature! No wonder that some expressed reservations about this.

Actually, the above is a good example of one of my worst weaknesses: I tend to assume that I write for people who will make the same assumptions I do, look at issues the way I look at them and understand what is implied. My bad. So today I will try to spell out what I mean and clarify my point of view on this issue. To do this, however, there are a number of premises which I think need to be explicitly spelled out.

First, how does one measure the quality of an armed force and how can armed forces from different countries be compared?

The first thing which needs to immediately get out of the way is the absolutely useless practice known as "bean counting": counting the numbers of tanks, armored personnel carriers, infantry combat vehicles, artillery pieces, aircraft, helicopters and ships for country A and country B and come to some conclusion about which of the two is "stronger". This is utterly meaningless. Next, two more myths need to be debunked: high tech wins wars and big money wins wars. Since I discussed these two myths in some detail elsewhere (<http://thesaker.is/debunking-popular-cliches-about-modern-warfare/>).

I won't repeat it all here.

Next, I submit that the purpose of a military force is to achieve a specific political objective. Nobody goes to war just for the sake of war and "victory" is not a military, but a political concept. So yes, war is the continuation of politics by other means. For example, the successful deterrence of a potential aggressor should be counted as a "victory" or, at least, as a successful performance of your armed forces if their goal was to deter. The definition of "victory" can include destroying the other guy's armed forces, of course, but it does not have to. The British did win the war in the Malvinas/Falklands even though the Argentinian forces were far

from destroyed. Sometimes the purpose of war is genocide, in which case just defeating a military force is not enough.

Let's take a recent example: according to an official statement by Vladimir Putin (<http://thesaker.is/analysis-of-the-russian-military-pullout-from-syria/>), the official objectives of the Russian military intervention in Syria were to 1) stabilize the legitimate authority and 2) create conditions for a political compromise. It is undeniable that the Russian armed forces fully reached these two objectives, but they did so without the need for the kind of "victory" which implies a total destruction of your enemy's forces. In fact, Russia could have used nuclear weapons and carpet bombing to wipe out Daesh, but that would have resulted in a political catastrophe for Russia. Would that have been a "military victory"? You tell me!

So, if the purpose of a country's armed forces is to achieve specific and political objectives, this directly implies that saying that some country's armed forces can do anything, anywhere and at any time is nonsense. You cannot assess a military outside a very specific set of circumstances:

- 1) Where: Space/geographical
- 2) When: Time/duration
- 3) What: political objective

Yet, what we see, especially in the USA, is a diametrically opposite approach. It goes something like this: *we have the best trained, best equipped and best-armed military on earth; no country can compete with our advanced stealth bombers and nuclear submarines; our pilots are the best trained on the planet; we have advanced network-centric warfare capabilities, global strike, space-based reconnaissance, and intelligence; we have aircraft carriers; our Delta Force can defeat any terrorist force; we spend more money training our special forces than any other country; we have more ships than any other nation; etc. etc. etc.* This means absolutely

nothing. The reality is that the US military played a secondary role in WWII in the European theater and that after that the only “kinda victory” it achieved is outright embarrassing: Grenada (barely), and Panama (almost unopposed). I would agree that the US military was successful in deterring a Soviet attack, but I would also immediately point out that the Soviets then also successfully deterred a US attack. Is that a victory? The truth is that China also did not suffer from a Soviet or US attack; does that mean that the Chinese successfully deterred the Soviets or the Americans? If you reply ‘yes’ then you would have to accept that they did that at a fraction of the US costs, so whose military was more effective – the US or the Chinese one? Then look at all the other US military interventions. There is a decent list in Wikipedia under [Timeline\\_of\\_United\\_States\\_military\\_operations](#). What did those military operations really achieve? If I had to pick a “least bad one” I would reluctantly pick the Desert Storm which did liberate Kuwait from the Iraqis, but at what cost and with what consequences?!

In the vast majority of cases, when the quality of the Russian armed forces is assessed, it is always in comparison to the US armed forces. But does that make sense to compare the Russian armed forces to a military which has a long record of not achieving the specific political objectives it was given? Yes, the US armed forces are huge; bloated. They are the most expensive on the planet, the most technology-intensive and their rather mediocre actual performance is systematically obfuscated by the most powerful propaganda machine on the planet. But does any of that make them effective? I submit that far from being effective, they are fantastically wasteful and amazingly ineffective, at least from a military point of view.

Still dubious?

Okay. Let's take the "best of the best": the US Special Forces. Please name me three successful operations executed by US Special Forces. No, small size skirmishes against poorly trained and poorly equipped 3<sup>rd</sup> world insurgents killed in a surprise attack don't qualify. What would be the US equivalent of, say, Operation Storm-333

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation\\_Storm-333](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation_Storm-333))

or the liberation of the entire Crimean Peninsula without a single person killed? In fact, there is a reason why most Hollywood blockbusters about US special forces are based on abject defeats such as Black Hawk Down

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Black\\_Hawk\\_Down\\_\(film\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Black_Hawk_Down_(film)))

or 13 hours

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/13\\_Hours:\\_The\\_Secret\\_Soldiers\\_of\\_Benghazi](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/13_Hours:_The_Secret_Soldiers_of_Benghazi)).

As for US high-tech, I don't think that I need to dwell too deeply on the nightmares of the F-35 or the Zumwalt-class destroyer or explain how sloppy tactics made it possible for the Serbian Air Defenses to shoot down a super-secret and putatively "invisible" F-117A in 1999 using an ancient Soviet-era S-125 missile first deployed in 1961!

There is no *Schadenfreude* for me in reminding everybody of these facts. My point is to try to break the mental reflex which conditions so many people to consider the US military as some kind of measuring stick against which the performance of all the other armed forces on the planet is measured. This reflex is the result of propaganda and ignorance, not any rational reason. The same goes, by the way, for the other hyper-propagandized military – the Israeli Defense Force (IDF) whose armored forces, pilots, and infantrymen are always presented as amazingly well-trained and competent. The reality is, of course, that in 2006 the IDF could not even secure the small town of Bint Jbeil located just 2 miles from

the Israeli border. For 28 days the IDF tried to wrestle control of Bint Jbeil from second rate Hezbollah forces (Hezbollah kept its first rate forces north of the Litani river to protect Beirut) and totally failed in spite of having a huge numerical and technological superiority.

I have personally spoken to US officers who trained with the IDF and I can tell you that they were totally unimpressed. Just as Afghan guerrillas are absolutely unanimous when they say that the Soviet soldier is a much better soldier than the US one.

Speaking of Afghanistan.

Do you remember that the Soviet 40th Army who was tasked with fighting the Afghan “freedom fighters” was mostly under-equipped, under-trained, and poorly supported in terms of logistics? Please read this appalling report

(<http://fmso.leavenworth.army.mil/documents/afgmed/afgmed.htm>) about the sanitary conditions of the 40th Army and compare that with the 20 billion dollars per year

(<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2008422/U-S-military-spends-cool-20billion-air-conditioning-annually-Iraq-Afghanistan.html>)

the US spends on air-conditioning in Afghanistan and Iraq! And then compare the US and Soviet occupations in terms of performance: not only did the Soviets control the entire country during the day (at night the Afghans controlled most of the countryside and the roads); they also controlled all the major cities 24/7. In contrast, the US barely holds on to Kabul and entire provinces are in the hands of the insurgents

(<http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/interactive/2016/08/afghanista-n-controls-160823083528213.html>).

The Soviets built hospitals, dams, airports, roads, bridges, etc. whereas the Americans built exactly nothing. And, as I already mentioned, in every interview I have seen the Afghans are

unanimous: the Soviets were much tougher enemies than the Americans.

I could go on for pages and pages, but let's stop here and simply accept that the PR image of the US (and Israeli) military has nothing to do with their actual capabilities and performance. There are things which the US military does very well (long distance deployment, submarine warfare in temperate waters, carrier operations, etc.) but their overall effectiveness and efficiency are pretty low.

So what makes the Russian armed forces so good?

For one thing, their mission, to defend Russia, is commensurate with the resources of the Russian Federation. Even if Putin wanted it, Russia does not have the capabilities to build 10 aircraft carriers, deploy hundreds of overseas bases or spend more on “defense” than the rest of mankind combined. The specific political objective given to the Russian military is quite simple: to deter or repel any attack against Russia.

Second, to accomplish this mission the Russian armed forces need to be able to strike and prevail at a maximum distance of 1000km or less from the Russian border

(<http://thesaker.is/assessing-the-russian-military-as-an-instrument-of-power/>).

Official Russian military doctrine places the limits of a strategic offensive operation a bit further and include the complete defeat of enemy forces and occupation of his territory to a depth of 1200km-1500km (*Война и Мир в Терминах и Определениях*, Дмитрий Рогозин, Москва, Вече, 2011, p.155) but in reality this distance would be much shorter, especially in the case of a defensive counter-attack. Make no mistake, this remains a formidable task due to the immense length of the Russian border (over 20,000km of border) running over almost every imaginable type of geography, from dry deserts and mountains to the North Pole

region. And here is the amazing thing: the Russian armed forces are currently capable of defeating any conceivable enemy all along this perimeter. Putin himself said so recently when he declared:

“We can say with certainty: We are stronger now than any potential aggressor; any!”

(<http://www.foxnews.com/world/2016/12/22/putin-russias-military-is-stronger-than-any-potential-aggressor.html>)

I realize that for a mostly American audience this will sound like the typical garden variety claptrap every US officer or politician has to say on every public occasion, but in the Russian context this is something quite new: Putin had never said anything like that before. If anything, the Russians prefer to whine about how numerically superior their adversaries seem to be - (well, they are, numerically – which every Russian military analyst knows means nothing).

Numerically, the Russian forces are, indeed, much smaller than NATO’s or China’s. In fact, one could argue for the size of the Russian Federation, the Russian armed forces are rather small. True. But they are formidable, well-balanced in terms of capabilities and they make maximal use of the unique geographical features of Russia.

[Sidebar: Russia is a far more “northern” country than, say, Canada or Norway. Look at where the vast majority of the cities and towns in Canada or Scandinavia are located. Then look at a map of Russia and the latitudes at which the Russian cities are located. The difference is quite striking. Take the example of Novosibirsk, which in Russia is considered a southern Siberian town. It is almost at the same latitude as Edinburgh, Scotland, Grande Prairie, Alberta or Malmö in Sweden]



This is why all the equipment used by the Russian Armed Forces has to be certified operational from temperatures ranging from -50C to +50C (-58F to 122F). Most western gear can't even operate in such extremes. Of course, the same also goes for the Russian soldier who is also trained to operate in this range of temperatures.

I don't think that there is another military out there who can claim to have such capabilities, and most definitely not the American armed forces.

Another myth which must be debunked is the one of Western technological superiority. While it is true that in some specific fields the Soviets were never able to catch up with the West - microchips for example. That did not prevent them from being the first ones to deploy a large list of military technologies such as phased-array radars on interceptors, helmet-mounted sights for pilots, super cavitating underwater missiles, autoloading on tanks, parachute deployable armored vehicles, double-hulled attack submarines, road-mobile ICBMs, etc. As a rule, Western weapon systems tend to be more tech-heavy. That is true, but that is not due to a lack of Russian capabilities but to a fundamental difference in design. In the West, weapon systems are designed by engineers who cobble together the latest technologies and then design a mission around them. In Russia, the military defines a mission and then seeks the simplest and cheapest technologies which can be used to accomplish it. This is why the Russian MiG-29 (1982) was not a "fly-by-wire" (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fly-by-wire>) like the US F-16 (1978) but operated by "old" mechanical flight controls. I would add here that a more advanced airframe and two engines instead of one for the F-16, gave the MiG-29 a superior flight envelope.

([http://forum.keypublishing.com/showthread.php?47529-MiG-29-kontra-F-16-\(aerodynamics-\)](http://forum.keypublishing.com/showthread.php?47529-MiG-29-kontra-F-16-(aerodynamics-)))

When needed, however, the Russians did use fly-by-wire, for example, on the Su-27 (1985).

Last but not least, the Russian nuclear forces are currently more modern and much more capable than the comparatively aging US nuclear triad. Even the Americans admit that.

So what does that all mean?

This means that in spite of being tasked with an immensely difficult mission, to prevail against any possible enemy along the 20,000+km of the Russian border and to a depth of 1000km, the Russian armed forces have consistently shown that they are capable of fulfilling the specific political objective of either deterring or defeating their potential enemy; be it a Wahabi insurgency (which the western pundits described as “unbeatable”); a western trained and equipped Georgian military (in spite of being numerically inferior during the crucial hours of the war and in spite of major problems and weaknesses in command and control); the disarmament of 25,000+ Ukrainian (supposedly “crack”) troops in Crimea without a single shot fired in anger and, of course, the Russian military intervention in the war in Syria where a tiny Russian force turned the tide of the war.

In conclusion, I want to come back to my statement about Russia being the only country which now openly dares to reject the Western civilizational model and whose leader, Vladimir Putin, enjoys the support of 80%+ of the population. These two factors are crucial in the assessment of the capabilities of the Russian armed forces. Why? Because they illustrate the fact that the Russian soldier knows exactly what he fights for (or against) and that when he is deployed somewhere, he is not deployed as a tool for Gazprom, Norilsk Nickel, Sberbank or any other Russian

corporation: he knows that he is fighting for his country, his people, his culture, for their freedom and their safety.

Furthermore, the Russian soldier also knows that the use of military force is not the first and preferred option of his government, but the last one which is used only when all other options have been exhausted. He knows that the Russian High Command, the Kremlin, and the General Staff are not hell-bent on finding some small country to beat up just to make an example and scare the others. Last but not least, the Russian soldier is willing to die for his country while executing any order. The Russians are quite aware of that and this is why two photos of US/Russian privates circulated on the Runet recently with the following descriptors:

"Privates of the US/Russian Army, under contract, deployed in a combat zone". "One of them needs to be fed, clothed, armed, paid, etc. The other one just needs to be ordered 'this way' and he will execute his mission. At any cost"

At the end of the day, the outcome of any war is decided by willpower. I firmly believe that and I also believe that it is the "simple" infantry private who is the most important factor in a war, not the super-trained superman. In Russia they are sometimes called "makhra" – the young kids from the infantry, not good-looking, not particularly macho, with no special gear or training. They are the ones who defeated the Wahabis in Chechnia, at a huge cost, but they did. They are the ones which produced an amazing number of heroes who amazed their comrades and enemies with their tenacity and courage. They don't look too good in parades and they are often forgotten. But they are the ones which defeated more empires than any other and who made Russia the biggest country on earth.

So yes, Russia currently does have the most capable armed forces on the planet. There are plenty of countries out there who

also have excellent armed forces. But what makes the Russian ones unique is the scope of their capabilities which range from anti-terrorist operations to international nuclear war combined with the amazing resilience and willpower of the Russian soldier. There are plenty of things the Russian military cannot do, but unlike the US armed forces, the Russian military was never designed to do anything, anywhere, anytime (aka "win\_two and a half wars" anywhere on the planet)

(<http://www.airforcemag.com/MagazineArchive/pages/2011/november%202011/1111watch.aspx>).

For the time being, the Russians are watching how the US could not even take a small city like Mosul, even though they had to supplement the local forces with plenty of US and NATO "support" and they are unimpressed, to say the least. But Hollywood will surely make a great blockbuster from this embarrassing failure and there will be more medals handed out than personnel involved (this is what happened after the Grenada disaster). And the TV watching crowd will be reassured that "while the Russians did make some progress, their forces are still a far cry from their Western counterparts". Who cares?



## US vs. Iran – A War of Apples vs. Oranges

February 07, 2017

One of the most frustrating tasks is to try to debunk the Hollywood myths imprinted on the mind of Americans about warfare in general (<http://www.unz.com/tsaker/debunking-popular-cliches-about-modern-warfare/>) and about Special Forces and technology in particular. When last week I wrote my column about the first SNAFUs of the Trump Presidency (<http://www.unz.com/tsaker/trump-presidency-first-snafus-already/>) I pretty much expected that some of the points I made would fall on deaf ears and that indeed did happen. What I propose to do today is to try, yet again, to explain the vast difference between what I would call “the American way of war” as seen in propaganda movies and the reality of warfare.

Let's begin with the issue of the use of special operation forces and immediately say what they are not: special operation forces are not SWAT or anti-terrorist forces. The US propaganda machine has imprinted on the mind of people in the West that if a force is "elite" and looks "tacti-cool" it is some kind of special force. By those criteria, even some riot cops could be considered as “special forces”. This is, by the way, not only an American sin. The Russians have gone down the exact same ridiculous road and now you have “Spetsnaz” forces all over Russia – even the Russian equivalent of the US department of correction which now has “Spetsnaz” forces to deal with prison riots! Likewise, the famous anti-terrorist unit “A” (mistakenly called “Alpha” as opposed to the US “Delta”) is exactly that – an anti-terrorist unit and not a military special force. So what are, *stricto sensu*, Special Forces? They are a military force which participates in the overall war effort but operates autonomously and not in direct support of the

main/conventional fighting force. Depending on the country and service, Special Forces can deal with a variety of tasks ranging from providing "advisors" to what Americans call direct action ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Direct\\_action\\_\(military\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Direct_action_(military))) operations such as the recent ill-fated attack on the al-Qaeda compound in Yemen ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yakla\\_raid](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yakla_raid)). Just like airborne forces, Special Forces have often been misused, especially when conventional forces could not be counted on, but that does not mean that SWAT and anti-terrorist forces should be thought of as "special forces". Special Forces are always military forces and they operate in support of military operations.

[Sidebar: some American readers who were miffed by my assertions that US Special Forces have a terrible real-life record have tried to counter with a logically fallacious argument: what about Russian Special Forces, are they any better? Examples are given: Beslan, Nord-Ost, and Budennovsk. There are two problems with this argument: one, none of these events can be considered as "special operations" and, two, even if the Russian Special Forces have a terrible record, this hardly means that the US Special Forces' record is good or, even less so, better. Besides, these three tragedies are totally different. The Budennovsk hospital hostage crisis was, indeed, a total disaster which occurred against the backdrop of another total disaster, the First Chechen war, and which resulted in 130 dead civilians out of a total of about 2000. That is; 93.5% of hostages survived. Considering that the civilian political authorities were arguably the worst in Russian history and considering that the hostage takers were well over 100 hardened Chechen terrorists, I think that

this is not the “disaster” that civilians like to think. Next, let’s look at Beslan. Here we have well over 1000 hostages with 385 fatalities – much more of a “disaster” indeed. But let’s remember what happened that day: a bomb, apparently one of the biggest, held in the sports hall, blew up, which resulted in local civilians (parents) spontaneously storming the school. At this point, the anti-terror forces simply joined in to save as many people as possible and many of them died by shielding the kids with their own bodies. There is simply no way that Beslan can be blamed on Russian anti-terrorist forces. As for Nord-Ost, this is one of the most successful hostage rescue operations in history: about 900 hostages were taken by about 45 terrorists. As a result of the operation, all of the civilians were freed, all of the terrorists were killed and all the anti-terrorist troops survived. Not a single bomb was detonated. However, the tragedy happened after the operation when the medical services simply did not have enough manpower to revive the freed hostages, some of whom even died in buses on the way to medical care. In theory, every single one of these hostages had undergone a full anesthesia (without being intubated) and every single one of them needed to be revived by a medical team. In their worst nightmares, the Russian anti-terrorist forces had never expected to deal with such a huge number of civilians needing immediate specialized medical care. The civilian emergency medical response units were completely overwhelmed and did not even know what gas had been used. As a result, 130 hostages died, or about 15% of the hostages. Had the terrorists had not decided to use gas the most

likely casualty figure would have been well over 500, if not more. That is hardly what I would call a failure of the entire operation, including the civilian support. In terms of pure anti-terrorist operations, it is probably the most successful hostage liberation operation in history. Let me end this sidebar with a simple question: when is the last time that any anti-terrorist force in the West had to deal with a situation involving over 1000 hostages taken by a large number of ruthless military-trained terrorists?]

If one is absolutely determined to assess the Russian record on special operations I would point to the capture of the Ruzyně International Airport in Prague in 1968, the storming of the Tajbeg Palace in Afghanistan in 1979 and, of course, the Russian operation to seize Crimea in 2014. But, again, there is no logical need to prove that Russians can do it well/better or to assert that Americans can't.

Now let's turn to the issue of a possible war between Iran and the United States.

The dumbest possible thing to evaluate the possible outcomes of a US attack on Iran would be to compare all the technologies available to both countries and come to some kind of conclusion. For an example of that kind of nonsense, check out this typical article: (<http://mil-embedded.com/guest-blogs/war-with-iran/>). Generally, the obsession with technology is a typical American pathology which is a direct result of fighting overseas wars against vastly out-gunned enemies. I call that the engineer's view of war, as opposed to the soldier's view. That is not to say that technology does not matter, it does, but tactics, operations, and strategy matter a whole lot more. For example, while it is true that a modern M1A2 Abrams is vastly superior to an old Soviet T-55, there are



circumstances (high mountains, forests) where the T-55, properly engaged, would be a much better tank. Likewise, putatively outdated WWII anti-tank guns can be used with devastating effect on modern APCs just as outdated air defense guns can be turned into absolutely terrifying assault fire support vehicles.

In the case of the US attack on Iran, only a total ignoramus would suppose that as soon as the Iranians detect the US attack they would scramble their mostly dated air force to try to achieve air superiority or that they would hope to stop the US attack using their air-defenses. Let me remind everybody here that Hezbollah made exactly zero use of their air defenses (only MANPADS anyway) during the Israeli attack on Lebanon in 2006 and that did not prevent Hezbollah from inflicting upon the IDF the most crushing defeat in their history. Why?

Because, generally, the American way of war doesn't really work. What do I mean by "American way of war"? Using airstrikes and missile attacks to degrade the enemy's capabilities to such a degree that it forces him to surrender. This was tried against the Serbian military in Kosovo and resulted in an abject failure: the Serbian forces survived the 78 days of massive NATO bombing completely unscathed (a few MBTs (main battle tanks) and APCs (armored personnel carriers) were lost, that's about it). When that failure became apparent to the NATO commanders they did what the US military always does and turned against the civilian Serbian population in retaliation (same as the Israelis in Lebanon, of course) while offering Milosevic a deal: you surrender and we leave you in power. He accepted and ordered the Serbian military out of Kosovo. This was a spectacular political success for NATO, but in purely military terms, this was a disaster (well-concealed from the western public opinion courtesy of the best propaganda machine in history).

In one case only did the American way of war really work as advertised: during the first Gulf War. And there is a good reason for that.

During the Cold War US force planners and strategists had developed a number of concepts to prepare for a war in Europe against the Soviet Union. Such concepts included the Air Land Battle doctrine or the Follow-on-Forces Attack (FOFA) which I shall not discuss in detail here, but which all placed a heavy emphasis on long-range reconnaissance-strike systems and the use of air forces to defeat an assumed Soviet conventional superiority, especially in armor. I believe that these were fundamentally sound doctrines which could have been used effectively in the European theater. By the time Iraq invaded Kuwait, the USA had honed these concepts to quasi-perfection and the US armed forces were well trained in applying them. Saddam Hussein then committed a series of unforgivable mistakes, the worst one being to give the USA many months to deploy into the KSA (this blatantly contradicts Soviet military doctrine which tells me that Saddam Hussein did not listen to his Soviet-trained generals or that these generals were afraid to speak up).

Apparently, Saddam Hussein believed that having fought the Iranians during the Iraq-Iran war (1980-1988) he was ready to take on the USA. Well, he wasn't. In fact, the way the Iraqis prepared for a US attack was a dream come true for US force planners and analysts because Saddam gave them the absolutely \*perfect\* target: large armored formations deployed in a desert with no air cover. The US, who for years had prepared to fight a much more sophisticated Soviet conventional military in the complex central European terrain ("*Mischgelende*" forests, many villages and town, rapid streams, steep hills, and riverbanks, etc.) could simply not believe their luck: the Iraqis deployed in the worst possible manner making them an ideal target, much easier in fact than what was

practiced for in US desert training. The result was predictable; the USA simply crushed the Iraqis and took almost no casualties.

Guess who observed that from right across the border with rapt attention?

The Iranians, of course.

If anybody seriously believes that the Iranians will prepare for a US attack by trying to out-American the Americans I have a few bridges to sell to them.

What Iranians, and Hezbollah, perfectly understood is that the key to prevailing against the USA is to deny them the American way of war and to impose on them a type of warfare they absolutely loathe. We can call that the Iranian way of war. Here are a few of its key components:

1) **Assume that the American will establish air supremacy** in 24 hours or less and deny them any lucrative targets. Sounds simple, but it is not. This requires a number of steps which can take years to implement including, but not limited to, concealing, hardening and deeply burying the most valuable civilian and military assets, creating a highly redundant network of communication and preparing for semi-autonomous operations when communications fail, creating a country-wide system of local civilian-military cooperation aimed at the survivability of essential government services including law and order, having procedures in place to compensate for the disruption of energy distribution and the destruction of key transportation nodes, etc. It might be my Swiss training speaking here, but I would assume that over the past 30 years the Iranians have dug thousands of miles of underground tunnels and command posts which allows the country to literally "go under" for as long as is needed.

2) **Develop a number of key advanced technologies** such as GPS-spoofing, computer network penetration and disruption, electronic counter-measures warfare, advanced mine warfare,

small boat operations and, of course, missile strikes not to deny the US forces any portion of the Iranian territory, but to dramatically increase the risks and costs of US operations. This is where a limited number of advanced air defense systems can make a critical difference, especially if successfully concealed.

3) **Engage in “horizontal escalation”**: rather than wasting efforts in trying to shoot down US aircraft, use missile strikes to destroy US airfields (and ports) in the region. That is, by the way, official Iranian doctrine

(<http://en.farsnews.com/newstext.aspx?nn=13951117000363>). Or strike at US forces in Iraq or Afghanistan. Target Israel or, even better, the Saudi regime. Force the US Navy to either engage in brown-water or, at most, green-water operations (here the Russian Kilo-class subs will excel) or force them to move back and shut down the Strait of Hormuz (the US Navy hates brown and green water operations, and for good reason, the USN is a blue-water navy *par excellence*) and the Americans are acutely aware of what happened to the US-built Israeli Sa’ar 5-class corvette when it got hit by Hezbollah fired Chinese-built C-802 missile.

4) **Play the time card**: time is always against the US military as the expectation is a short, easy war, with as few casualties as possible and then a quick "out". The Israelis ran out of steam in 33 days, NATO in 78 – so plan for at least a 12-month long conflict. Western forces have no staying power, let them hope for a “quickie” and then see how they react when it ain’t happening.

5) **Use the traditional American sense of superiority** and condescension for “sand niggers” or “hajis” and don't bother trying to intimidate them. Instead, try to use that racist mindset to make them commit crucial strategic mistakes as Iran did when it used fake Iraqi “defectors” who spread disinformation about non-existing Iraqi WMDs to convince the US Neocons to lobby for an attack on Iraq to protect Israel. I find the notion of using US

Neocons to make the US get rid of Saddam Hussein and basically hand over Iraq to Iran nothing short of pure genius. This is, of course, why it is never mentioned in Western sources :-)

6) **Force the Americans to present you more targets:** the more US forces are deployed near Iran, the more targets they offer for Iranian counter-attacks and the more they get politically bogged-down (as shown by the recent Iraqi threat to revoke visas for US servicemen in Iraq in response to Trump's temporary visa ban; the threat is empty, but clearly nobody in the White House or Foggy Bottom ever considered such an option). Basically, being everywhere, CENTCOM forces are hated.

The above are just a few examples from a long list of things the Iranians can do to respond to a US attack on Iran. We can expect the Iranians to come up with a much longer and far more creative list. By the way, there is nothing new or original in the list I made above, and the Americans are quite aware of it. There is a reason why even though the US has come as close as being hours away from striking at Iran they always backed down at the last second. So we have that endless tug-of-war: the US politicians (who believe their own propaganda) want to strike Iran, while US military specialists (who know better than to believe their own propaganda) constantly try to prevent such an attack. I want to mention Admiral William Fallon here, a true hero and patriot, who bluntly declared about a possible attack on Iran “not on my watch” (<http://original.antiwar.com/bock/2008/03/15/fallon-leaves-will-iran-war-follow/>) in direct defiance of his political superiors. I hope that one day his service to his country in a very difficult situation will be finally recognized.

One more thing: Israel and the other regional powers. They are basically the equivalent of the vegetables served at a steakhouse: decoration. Just as NATO is a pretend force, so is the IDF and all the rest of the locals, including the Saudis, at least compared to

Iran and Hezbollah. Yes, sure, they spend a lot of money, purchase expensive systems, but should a war break out, the Americans will be carrying 90%+ of the burden of real warfare, as opposed to politically correct coalition-building. Iran is a very large country with a complex geography and the only ones who have the kind of power-project capabilities to strike at Iran other than symbolically are the Americans. Of course, I am quite sure that should the US strike at Iran the Israelis will feel obliged to strike at some putatively nuclear target, return home and declare victory of the "invincible Tsahal". But to the extent that Iran will be meaningfully hurt, it will be by the US, not Israel.

So does that mean that Iran would come out unscathed from a US attack? Absolutely not. What I expect the Americans to do is what they have always done: engage in the mass murder of civilians in retaliation for their military failures. I know that this will, yet again, offend some *doubleplusgoodthinking* Patriots, but massacring civilians is an American tradition dating from the very foundation of the United States. Anybody doubting that ought to read the superb book by John Grenier (USAF Ret.) entitled "The First Way of War 1607-1814: American War Making on the Frontier"

(<https://www.amazon.com/First-Way-War-American-1607-1814/dp/0521732638/>)

which explains in exquisite detail how the US anti-civilian terror operations doctrine was developed over the centuries. This is, of course, what the Anglos did during WWII when they engaged in mass bombings of German cities to "break their spirit of resistance". And this is what they did in Iraq and Serbia and what the Israelis did in Lebanon. And this is exactly what we should expect will happen in Iran. At least, this is the worst case scenario. There are really fundamentally two basic options for a US attack on

Iran and I outlined them in my 2007 article about Iranian asymmetrical response options:

(<http://thesaker.is/irans-asymmetrical-response-options/>):

*“Broadly speaking, we see the Neocon Empire as having two options in an attack on Iran:*

- 1. A short, limited, attack on some Iranian nuclear and government installations. The goals of that kind of attack would be solely political: to appear to have "done something", give the despondent Americans and Israelis some flags to wave, to "show resolve" and "send a firm message" – the kind of State Department nonsense. If lucky, they could hope to kill some Iranian leaders (although what exactly that would achieve is anyone's guess). Lastly, it would punish the Iranians for their "bad behavior".*
- 2. A more significant military attack, which could not be limited to an air campaign and one which would have to include at least some insertion of ground forces. That would be similar to the strategy outlined in my How they might do it article (<http://thesaker.is/how-they-might-do-it/>). The goal of this option would be radically different from the first one: "to punish the Iranian population for its support of 'the Mullahs' (as the expression goes in the USA) via the ballot box.*

*This is exactly the same logic which brought the Israelis to hammer all of Lebanon with bombs, missiles, and mines – the same logic by which they killed over 500 people in Gaza – the same logic by which the U.S. bombed all of Serbia and Montenegro and the same logic which explains the bizarre embargo of Cuba. The*

*message here is: if you support the bad guys, you will pay for it.”*

The option I discussed today is the 2<sup>nd</sup> one because this is the one which would get most people killed. But make no mistake, since neither one of these options would result in anything remotely resembling a victory (this is a political concept defining an achieved political objective) one would have to conclude that both of these options would result in failure and defeat. Such an attack would also seal the end of the US political role in the Middle-East unless, of course, being a despised elephant in a porcelain store is considered a "role". But make no mistake, even if the Iranian casualty figures go in the hundreds of thousands, or even over a million like in Iraq, the Iranians will not surrender and they will prevail. For one thing, terrorizing civilians has never worked. Genocide can be a much more viable option, but there are too many Iranians to do that and they are too well dug-in in their country to contemplate such an option (sorry, Israelis, even nuking Iran will not result in a "victory" of any kind). The Iranians have been at it for, what, 3000-9000 years (depending on how you count) and they will not be subdued, submitted or defeated with 200 or 70-year-old States, or by an Anglo-Zionist Empire in terminal decline.

I suspect that by now quite a few readers will be thoroughly irritated with me. So what better way is there for me to end this discussion than by adding religion to the mix? Yes, let's do that!

Most Iranian are Shia, that is well known. But what is less well-known is one of the key mottoes of the Shia which, I believe, beautifully expresses one of the key features of the Shia ethos, is: *“Every day is Ashura and every land is Karbala”*. You can find an explanation of this phrase here:



[http://en.wikishia.net/view/Every\\_day\\_is\\_Ashura\\_and\\_every\\_land\\_is\\_Karbala](http://en.wikishia.net/view/Every_day_is_Ashura_and_every_land_is_Karbala). It basically expresses the willingness to die for the truth at any time and in any place. Millions of Iranians, even those not necessarily very pious, have been raised with this determination to fight and resist, at any cost. And now think of Donald Trump or General “Mad Dog” Mattis and try to imagine how hollow and grotesque they and their threats look to their Iranian counterparts.

Should I write an analysis of Chinese response options to a US attack? Nah – let’s just say that if the US doesn’t have what it takes to prevail over Iran, an attack on China would be simply suicidal. Next week, alas, I will probably have to turn back to the dramatic events in the Ukraine.



# The Neocons and the “Deep State” Have Neutered Trump; It’s Over Folks!

February 14, 2017

Less than a month ago I warned that a ‘color revolution’ was taking place in the USA (<http://thesaker.is/a-color-revolution-is-under-way-in-the-united-states/>). My first element of proof was the so-called "investigation" which the CIA, FBI, NSA, and others were conducting against President Trump's candidate to become National Security Advisor, General Flynn. Tonight, the plot to get rid of Flynn has finally succeeded and General Flynn had to offer his resignation. (<http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-38965557>). Trump accepted it.

Now let's immediately get one thing out of the way: Flynn was hardly a saint or a perfectly wise man that would single-handedly save the world. That he was not. However, Flynn was the cornerstone of Trump’s national security policy. For one thing, Flynn dared the unthinkable: he dared to declare that the bloated US intelligence community had to be reformed. Flynn also tried to subordinate the CIA and the Joint Chiefs to the President via the National Security Council. Put differently, Flynn tried to wrestle the ultimate power and authority from the CIA and the Pentagon and subordinate them back to the White House. Flynn also wanted to work with Russia. Not because he was a Russia lover; the notion of a Director of the DIA as a Putin-fan is ridiculous; but Flynn was rational. He understood that Russia was no threat to the USA or to Europe and that Russia and the West had common interests. That was another absolutely unforgivable *crimethink* in Washington DC.

The Neocon-run ‘deep state’ has now forced Flynn to resign under the idiotic pretext that he had a telephone conversation, on

an open, insecure and clearly monitored, line with the Russian ambassador.

And Trump accepted this resignation.

Ever since Trump made it to the White House, he has taken blow after blow from the Neocon-run Ziomeia, from Congress, from all the Hollywood *doubleplusgoodthinking* “stars” and even from European politicians. And Trump took each blow without ever fighting back. Nowhere was his famous “you are fired!” to be seen. But I still had hope. I wanted to hope. I felt that it was my duty to hope.

But now Trump has betrayed us all.

Remember how Obama showed his true face when he hypocritically denounced his friend and pastor Rev. Jeremiah Wright Jr.?

(<https://thecaucus.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/03/14/obama-condemns-pastors-statements/>)

Today, Trump has shown us his true face. Instead of refusing Flynn’s resignation and instead of firing those who dared cook up these ridiculous accusations against Flynn, Trump accepted the resignation. This is not only an act of abject cowardice, it is also an amazingly stupid and self-defeating betrayal because now Trump will be alone; completely alone, facing the likes of Mattis and Pence – hard Cold Warrior types; ideological to the core; folks who want war and simply don't care about reality.

Again, Flynn was not my hero; but he was, by all accounts, Trump’s hero. And Trump betrayed him.

The consequences of this will be immense. For one thing, Trump is now clearly broken. It took the ‘deep state’ only a few weeks to castrate Trump and to make him bow to the powers that be. Those who would have stood behind Trump will now feel that he will not stand behind them and they will all move back away from him. The Neocons will feel elated by the elimination of their

worst enemy and emboldened by this victory they will push on, doubling-down over and over and over again.

It's over, folks. The deep state has won.

From now on, Trump will become the proverbial *shabbos-goy*; the errand boy of the Israeli lobby. Hassan Nasrallah was right when he called him 'an idiot'

(<http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/224872>).

The Chinese and Iranians will openly laugh. The Russians won't – they will be polite; they will smile and try to see if some common sense policies can still be salvaged from this disaster. Some might. But any dream of a partnership between Russia and the United States has died tonight.

The EU leaders will, of course, celebrate. Trump was nowhere near the scary bogeyman they feared. Turns out that he is a doormat – very good for the EU.

Where does all this leave us – the millions of anonymous 'deplorables' who try as best we can to resist imperialism, war, violence, and injustice?

I think that we were right in our hopes because that is all we had – hopes. No expectations, just hopes. But now we objectively have very little reasons left to hope. For one thing, the Washington 'swamp' will not be drained. If anything, the swamp has triumphed. We can only find some degree of solace in two undeniable facts:

1. Hillary would have been far worse than any version of a Trump Presidency.
2. In order to defeat Trump, the US deep state has had to terribly weaken the US and the AngloZionist Empire. Just like Erdogan's purges have left the Turkish military in shambles, the anti-Trump 'color revolution' has inflicted terrible damage on the reputation, authority and even credibility of the USA.

The first one is obvious. So let me clarify the second one. In their hate-filled rage against Trump and the American people (aka “the basket of deplorables”) the Neocons have had to show their true face. By their rejection of the outcome of the elections; by their riots; their demonization of Trump; the Neocons have shown two crucial things: first, that the US democracy is a sad joke and that they, the Neocons, are an occupation regime which rules against the will of the American people. Second, just like Israel, the USA has no legitimacy left. And since, just like Israel, the USA is unable to frighten their enemies, they are basically left with nothing; no legitimacy; no ability to coerce. So yes, the Neocons have won. But their victory removes the last chance for the US to avoid a collapse.

Trump, for all his faults, did favor the US, as a country, over the global Empire. Trump was also acutely aware that ‘more of the same’ was not an option. He wanted policies commensurate with the actual capabilities of the USA. With Flynn gone and the Neocons back in full control – this is over. Now we are going to be right back to ideology over reality.

Trump probably could have made America, well, maybe not “great again”, but at least stronger, a major world power which could negotiate and use its leverage to get the best deal possible from the others. That’s over now. With Trump broken, Russia and China will go right back to their pre-Trump stance: a firm resistance backed by a willingness and capability to confront and defeat the USA at any level.

I am quite sure that nobody today is celebrating in the Kremlin. Putin, Lavrov and the others surely understand exactly what happened. It is as if Khodorkovsky would have succeeded in breaking Putin in 2003. In fact, **I have to credit Russian analysts who for several weeks already have been comparing Trump to Yanukovich, who also was elected by a majority of the people**

**and who failed to show the resolve needed to stop the ‘color revolution’ started against him. But if Trump is the new Yanukovich, will the US become the next Ukraine?**

Flynn was very much the cornerstone of the hoped-for Trump foreign policy. There was a real chance that he would reign in the huge, bloated and all-powerful three letter agencies and that he would focus US power against the real enemy of the West: the Wahabis. With Flynn gone, this entire conceptual edifice has now come down. We are going to be left with the likes of Mattis and his anti-Iranian statements. Clowns who only impress other clowns.

Today's Neocon victory is a huge event and it will probably be completely misrepresented by the official media. Ironically, Trump supporters will also try to minimize it all. But the reality is that barring a most unlikely last-minute miracle, it's over for Trump and the hopes of millions of people in the USA and the rest of the world who had hoped that the Neocons could be booted out of power by means of a peaceful election. That is clearly not going to happen.

I see very dark clouds on the horizon.

UPDATE1: Just to stress an important point: the disaster is not so much that Flynn is out but what Trump's caving into the Neocons tells us about Trump's character (or lack thereof). Ask yourself – after what happened to Flynn, would you stick your neck out for Trump?

UPDATE2: Just as predicted – the Neocons are celebrating and, of course, doubling-down:



# The Empire Should Be Placed On Suicide Watch

March 12, 2017

In all the political drama taking place in the USA as a result of the attempted color revolution against Trump

(<http://www.unz.com/tsaker/a-color-revolution-is-under-way-in-the-united-states>)

the bigger picture sometimes gets forgotten. And yet, this bigger picture is quite amazing; because if we look at it, we will see irrefutable signs that the Empire is engaged in some bizarre slow motion of seppuku and the only mystery left is who, or what will serve as the Empire's kaishakunin (assuming there will be one).

(<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kaishakunin>)

I would even argue that the Empire is pursuing a full-spectrum policy of self-destruction on several distinct levels, with each level contributing to the overall sum total suicide. And when I refer to self-destructive behavior, I don't mean long-term issues such as the non-sustainability of the capitalist economic model or the social consequences of a society which, not only is unable to differentiate right from wrong, but which now decrees that deviant behavior is healthy and normal. These are what I call "long-term walls" into which we will, inevitably, crash, but which are comparatively further away than some "immediate walls". Let me list a few of these:

**Political suicide:** the Neocons' refusal to accept the election of Donald Trump has resulted in a massive campaign to de-legitimize him. What the Neocons clearly fail to see, or don't care about, is that by de-legitimizing Trump they are also de-legitimizing the entire political process which brought Trump to power and upon which the United States is built as a society. As a direct result of

this campaign, not only are millions of Americans becoming disgusted with the political system they were indoctrinated to believe in, but internationally the notion of "American democracy" is becoming a sad joke.

And just to make things worse, the US corporate media is finally showing its true face and now unapologetically shows the entire world that not only is it not in any way "fair" or "objective", but that it is a 100% prostituted propaganda machine which faithfully serves the interests of the US "deep state".

A key element of the quasi-constant brainwashing of the average American has always been the regular holding of elections. Never mind that; at least until now the outcome of these elections made very little difference inside the USA and none at all outside. The goal was never to consult the people – the goal has always been to give the illusion of democracy and people power. Now that the Democrats say that the Russians rigged the elections and the Republicans say that it was the Democrats and their millions of dead voters who tried stealing it, it became rather obvious that these elections were always a joke, a pseudo-democratic "liturgy", a brainwashing ritual – you name it – but never about anything real.

The emergence of the concept of the 1% can be "credited" to the Obama Administration since it was during Obama that the entire "Occupy Wall Street" movement took off. But the ultimate unmasking of the viciously evil true face of that 1% must be credited to Hillary with her truly historical confession in which she openly declared that those who oppose her are a "basket of deplorables". We already knew, thanks to Victoria Nuland, what the AngloZionist leaders thought of the people of Europe; now we know what they think of the people of the USA: exactly the same thing.

The bottom line is this: I don't think that the moral authority and political credibility of the USA have ever been lower than



today. Decades of propaganda by Hollywood and the official US propaganda machine have now collapsed and nobody buys that counter-factual nonsense anymore.

**Foreign policy suicide:** let's see what options there are to choose from. The Neocons want a war with Russia which the Trump people don't. The Trump people, however, want, well, maybe not a war although that option is very much on the table, but at least a very serious confrontation with China, North Korea or Iran, and about half of them would also like some kind of confrontation with Russia. There is absolutely nobody, at least at the top, who would dare to suggest that a confrontation or, even worse, a war with China, Iran, North Korea or Russia would be a disaster; a calamity for the USA. In fact, serious people with impressive credentials and a lot of gravitas are discussing these possibilities as if they were real; as if the USA could in some sense prevail. This is laughable. Well, no, it is not. But it would be if it wasn't so frightening and depressing. The truth is very, very different.

[Sidebar: While it is probably not impossible for the United States to prevail, in purely military terms, against the DPRK in a war, the potential risks are nothing short of immense. And I don't mean the risk posed by the North Korean nukes which, apparently, is also quite real I mean the risk of starting a war against a country which has Seoul within conventional artillery range, an active duty army of well over one million people and 180,000 Special Forces operators. Let us assume for a second that the DPRK has no air force and no navy and an army composed of only 1M+ soldiers, 21k+ artillery pieces, and 180k special forces. How do you propose to deal with that threat? If you

have an easy, obvious solution, you have watched too many Hollywood movies. You probably also don't understand the terrain.]

But yes, the DPRK also has major weaknesses and I cannot exclude that the North Korean armed forces would rapidly collapse under a sustained attack by the US and the ROK. I did not say that I believe that this would happen, only that I don't exclude it. Should that happen, the US might well prevail relatively rapidly, at least in purely military terms. However, please keep in mind that any military operation has to serve a political goal and, in that sense, I cannot imagine any scenario under which the USA would walk away from a war against the DPRK with anything remotely resembling a real "victory". There is a paraphrase of something Ho Chi Minh allegedly told to the French

(<https://www.brainyquote.com/quotes/quotes/h/hochiminh347067.html>) in the 1940s which I really like.

It goes like this: "we kill some of you, you kill *a lot of us, and then we win*". That is how a war with the DPRK would probably play out. I call this the "American curse": Americans are very good at killing people, but they are not good at winning wars. Still, in the case of the DPRK, there is at least a possibility of a military victory, even if at a potentially huge cost. With Iran, Russia or China there is no such possibility at all: a war with any of them would be a guaranteed disaster (I wrote about a war in Iran here (<http://www.unz.com/tsaker/u-s-against-iran-a-war-of-apples-vs-oranges/>) and about a war with Russia too many times to count). So why is it that even though out of the 4 possible wars, one is a potential disaster and the 3 others are a guaranteed disaster; why is it that these are discussed as if they were potential options?!

The reason for that can be found in the unique mix of crass ignorance and political cowardice of the entire US political class.

First, a lot (most?) of US politicians believe in their own silly propaganda about the US armed forces being “the best” in “the world” (no evidence needed!). But even those who are smart enough to realize that this is a load of baloney which nobody outside the USA still takes seriously, they know that saying that publicly is political suicide. So they pretend, go along, and keep on repetitively spewing the patriotic mantra about “rah, rah, USA, USA, ‘Merika number one, we are the best” etc. Some figure that since the USA spends more on aggression than the rest of the planet combined, that must mean that the US armed forces must be “better” (whatever that means). To the birthplace of “bigger is better,” the answer is self-evident. It is also completely wrong.

Eventually, something crazy inevitably happens. Like in Syria where the State Department had one policy, the Pentagon another and the CIA yet another one. The resulting cognitive dissonance is removed by engaging in classical doublethink: “*yes, we screwed up over and over, but we are still the best*”. Ironically, that kind of mindset is at the core of the American inability to learn from past mistakes. If the choice is between an honest evaluation of past operations and political expediency, the latter always prevails (at least amongst civilians). (US servicemen are often far more capable of self-critical evaluation, especially in ranks up to Colonel and below. The problem here is that civilians and generals rarely listen to them.)

The result is total chaos: the US foreign policy is wholly dependent on the US ability to threaten the use of military force, but the harsh reality is that every country out there which dared to defy Uncle Sam did that only after coming to the conclusion that the US did not have the means to crush it militarily. In other words, only the weak, which are already de-facto US colonies, fear the USA. Or, put differently, the only countries who dare to defy Uncle Sam are the strong ones (that was all quite predictable, but

US politicians don't know about Hegel or dialectics). And just to make it worse, there is no real US foreign policy. What there is is only the sum vector of the different foreign policies desired by various more or less covert "deep state" actors, agencies and individuals. That resulting "sum vector" is inevitably short-term, focuses on a quick fix approach, and is unable to take into account any complexity.

As for the US "diplomacy", it simply doesn't exist. You don't need diplomats to deliver demands, bribes, ultimatums, and threats. You don't need educated people. Nor do you need people with any understanding of the "other". All you need is one arrogant self-enamored bully and one interpreter (since US diplomats don't speak the local languages either. And why would they?). We saw the most compelling evidence of the total *rigor mortis* of the US diplomatic corps when 51 US "diplomats" demanded that Obama bomb Syria.

(<http://dailycaller.com/2016/06/16/more-than-50-us-diplomats-urge-obama-to-strike-syria-in-memo/>) The rest of the world could just observe in amazement, sadness, bewilderment and total disgust.

The bottom line is this: there is no "US diplomacy". The USA has simply let that entire field atrophy to the point where it ceased to exist. When so many baffled observers try to understand what the US policy in the Ukraine or Syria is, they are making a mistaken assumption – that there is a US foreign policy to begin with. I would argue that the US diplomacy slowly and quietly passed away, sometime after James Baker (the last real US diplomat, and a brilliant one at that).

**Military suicide:** the US military was never a very impressive one, certainly not when compared to the British, Russian or German ones. But it did have a couple of very strong points including the ability to produce a lot of technical innovations

which made it possible to produce new, sometimes quite revolutionary, weapons. And if the US track record on ground operations was rather modest, the US did prove to be a most capable adversary in naval and aerial warfare. I don't think that it can be denied that for most of the years following WWII the USA had the most powerful and sophisticated navy and air force in the world. Then, gradually, things started getting worse and worse as the costs of the very expensive ships and aircraft shot through the roof while the quality of the produced systems appeared to be gradually degrading. Weapons systems which looked nothing short of awesome in the lab and test grounds proved to be almost useless once they were delivered to their end user on the battlefield. What happened? How did a country which produced the UH-1 Huey or the F-16 suddenly start producing Apaches and F-35s?! The explanation is painfully simple: corruption.

Not only did the US military industrial complex (MIC) bloat beyond any reasonable size, it also cloaked itself in so many layers of secrecy that massive corruption became inevitable. And when I speak of "massive corruption" I am not talking about millions but billions or even trillions. How? Simple – the Pentagon claimed it did not have the accounting tools needed to properly account for the missing money and that the money was therefore not really "missing". Another trick – no bid contracts. Or contracts which cover all the private contractor's costs, no matter how high or ridiculous. Desert Storm was a bonanza for the MIC, as was 9/11 and the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT). Billions of dollars got printed out of thin air, distributed (mostly under the cover of national security), hidden (secrecy) and stolen (by everybody in this entire food chain).

The feeding frenzy was so extreme that one of my teachers at SAIS admitted

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul\\_H.\\_Nitze\\_School\\_of\\_Advanced\\_International\\_Studies](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Paul_H._Nitze_School_of_Advanced_International_Studies)), off the record of course, that he had never seen a weapons system he did not like or which he did not want to purchase. This man, whom I shall not name, was a former director of the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Yes, you read that right. He was in charge of DIS-armament. You can imagine what the folks in charge of armament (no “dis) were thinking...

With the stratospheric rise of corruption, the kind of US general which had to be promoted went from fighting men who remembered Vietnam (where they often lost family members, relatives and friends) to ass-kissing "little chickenshits" ([http://www.correntewire.com/centcom\\_chief\\_admiral\\_fallon\\_petraeus\\_an\\_ass\\_kissing\\_little\\_chickenshit](http://www.correntewire.com/centcom_chief_admiral_fallon_petraeus_an_ass_kissing_little_chickenshit)) like David Petraeus. In less than half a century, US generals went from being combat men, to managers, to politicians. And it is against this lackluster background that a rather unimpressive personality like General James Mattis can appear, at least to some, like a good candidate for Secretary of Defense.

Bottom line: the US armed forces are fantastically expensive and yet not particularly well-trained, well-equipped or well-commanded. And while they still are much more capable than the many European militaries (which are a joke), they are most definitely not the kind of armed forces needed to impose and maintain a world hegemony. The good news for the USA is that the US armed forces are more than adequate to defend the USA against any hypothetical attack. But as the backbone of the Empire – they are close to useless.

I could list many more types of suicides including an economic suicide, a social suicide, an educational suicide, a cultural suicide and, of course, a moral suicide. But others have already done that elsewhere, and much better than I could ever do myself.

So all I will add here is one form of suicide which I believe the AngloZionist Empire has in common with the EU: a "Suicide by reality denial" (<http://www.unz.com/tsaker/the-eus-suicide-by-reality-denial/>) This is the mother and father of all the other forms of suicide – the stubborn refusal to look at reality and accept the fact that "the party is over". When I see the grim determination of US politicians (very much including the people supporting Trump) to continue to pretend as if the US hegemony was here to stay forever; when I see how they see themselves as the leaders of the world and how they sincerely believe that they need to get involved in every conflict on the planet, I can only come to the conclusion that the inevitable collapse will be painful. To be fair, Trump himself clearly has moments of lucidity about this; for example when he recently declared to Congress:

***“Free nations are the best vehicle for expressing the will of the people — and America respects the right of all nations to chart their own path. My job is not to represent the world. My job is to represent the United States of America. But we know that America is better off when there is less conflict — not more.”***

These are remarkable words for which Trump truly deserves a standing ovation as they are the closest thing to a formal admission that the United States has given up on the dream of being the World Hegemon and that from now on the US President will no longer represent the interest of trans-national plutocracies, but he will represent the interests of the American people. This sort of language is nothing short of revolutionary, whether Trump truly delivers on that or not. Unlike everybody else, Trump does not appear to suffer from "suicide by reality denial" syndrome; but when I look at the people around him (never mind the prostitutes in Congress) I wonder if he will ever get to act on his personal instincts.

Trump is clearly the best man in the Trump administration. He seems to have his heart in the right place and, unlike Hillary, he is clearly aware of the fact that the US armed forces are in a terrible shape. But a good heart and common sense are not enough to deal with the Neocons and the US deep state. You also need an iron will and a total determination to crush the opposition. Alas, so far, Trump has failed to show either quality. Instead, Trump is trying to show how "tough" a guy he is by declaring that he will wipe out Daesh and by giving the Pentagon 30 days to come up with a plan to do this. Alas (for Trump), there is no way to crush Daesh without working with those who already have boots on the ground: the Iranians, the Russians, and the Syrians. It is really that simple. And every American general knows that. Yet everybody is merrily plowing ahead as if there was some kind of possibility for the USA to crush Daesh without establishing a partnership with Russia, Iran and Syria first (Erdogan tried that. It did him no good. Now he is working with Russia and Iran). Will the good folks at the Pentagon find the courage to tell Trump: "no, Mr. President, we cannot do that alone, we need the Russians, the Iranians, and the Syrians"? I very much doubt it. So, yet again, we are probably going to see a case of reality denial; maybe not a suicidal one, but a significant one nonetheless. Not good.

Who will be the Empire's kaishakunin?

Alexander Solzhenitsyn used to say that all states can be placed on a continuum which ranges from states whose authority is based on their power, to states whose power is based on their authority. I think that we can agree that the authority of the USA is pretty close to zero. As for their power, it is still very substantial, but not sufficient to maintain the Empire. It is, however, more than adequate to protect the interests of the United States as a country provided the United States accept that they simply don't have the means to remain a world hegemon.



If the Neocons succeed in their attempt to overthrow or, failing that, at paralyzing Trump, then the Empire will have the choice between an endless horror or a horrible end. Since the Neocons don't really need a war with the DPRK, which they don't like, but which does not elicit the kind of blind hatred Iran does, my guess is that Iran will be their number one target. Should the AngloZionists succeed in triggering a war between Iran and the Empire, then Iran will end up being the Empire's *kaishakunin*. If the crazies fail in their manic attempts at triggering a major war, then the Empire will probably collapse under the pressure of the internal contradictions of the US society. Finally, if Trump and the American patriots who do not want to sacrifice their country for the sake of the Empire succeed in "draining the DC swamp" and finally crack down hard on the Neocons, then a gradual transition from Empire to major power is still possible. But the clock is running out fast.



# Searching for Russia

April 01, 2017

Whether one likes Russia or not, I think that everybody would agree that this country is really different; different in a profound and unique way. And there is some truth to that. One famous Russian author even wrote that “Russia cannot be understood rationally” (he used the expression “cannot be comprehended by the intellect”). Add to this already some rather eccentric politicians like Vladimir Zhirinovskii who is known to mix very rational and well-informed analyses with utter nonsense and you get the famous “Russia is a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma”. Frankly, this is just some witty hyperbole, Russia is not that mysterious. She is, however, rather dramatically different from the west, central and east European countries and even though a big chunk of Russia lies inside the European continent west of the Urals, in civilizational terms she is far removed from the so-called “West”, especially the modern West.

For example, Russia never underwent any “Renaissance”. I would even argue that Russia never really underwent any Middle-Ages either since, being an heir to the East Roman Empire (aka Byzantium), Russian roots are in the Antiquity. While one could, arguably, describe the phases of western civilization as Middle-Ages -> Renaissance -> Modernity -> Contemporary era, in the case of Russia the sequence would be a much shorter Antiquity -> Modernity -> Contemporary era.

[Sidebar: You will notice that I did place the roots of the modern western civilization in the Middle-Ages, not in the antiquity. The reason for that is the fact that

when the Franks finally conquered the western Roman Empire they destroyed it to such a degree that the era following the collapse of the Western Roman Empire is called the "Dark Ages" (Russia, by the way, never went through this millennium of darkness and, hence, she never had any need for any "renaissance" or "rebirth"). Contrary to the official historical narrative, the current Western civilization has never had any roots in the Roman Empire, and even less so, the Greek antiquity. The true founders of the "western world" were, in so many ways, the Franks]

I would, therefore, argue that, while geographically speaking, Russia (at least the most populated part of her) is in Europe, culturally she has never shared a common history or, even less so, a common culture with the West. To say that Russia is "Asian" is also problematic for two crucial reasons: first, Russia, as a culture, was born from the Baptism of ancient "Rus" by Saint Vladimir in the late 10th century. The brand of Christianity received by Russia was Roman, not the Frankish one. I don't believe that anybody would seriously argue that Rome or Byzantium were "Asian". So the cultural and spiritual roots of Russia are not Asian. Ethnically speaking, most Russians are Slavs, mixed to various degrees with other ethnic groups. And though I personally find the category "White" of dubious analytical value, I don't think that anybody would seriously argue that "Whites" are Asians. That leaves us with the Russian state, the Russian polity and here, yes, I would argue that it was the Asian Tatar-Mongol (an inaccurate and misleading term, but that is the commonly used one) invaders which created the modern Russian state. The complicating factor here is that since Russia became a western-style Empire under Peter I, she has been ruled by a mostly westernized elite which had much more in

common with the elites of Western Europe than with the majority of the Russian people. Both the 18th and 19th century in Russia were marked by a ruthless, and often violent imposition of Western political, social, cultural and religious models by the Russian ruling elites upon the Russian masses. This is a complex and multifaceted process which saw many contradictory phenomena taking place and we can argue forever about it. But what is certain is that this process ended in 1917 with a bourgeois (masonic) liberal coup d'état, followed, eight months later, by a Communist takeover and a bloody civil war. While neither the February coup nor the Communist takeover in November were true "revolutions", the year 1917, taken as a whole, saw an immense revolution take place: one ruling class was completely replaced by a completely different one.

I have neither the time nor the intention here to discuss the Soviet period. I have done so many times elsewhere; but I will only present my main conclusion here: there is no way to consider the Soviet period as a continuation of the pre-1917 Russia. Yes, geographically speaking the USSR more or less covered the previous Russian Empire and, yes, the population which lived in pre-1917 Russia continued to live in the new Soviet Union. But the roots of the dominant Bolshevik/Communist ideology in power were not found in ancient Russia and in the traditional Russian cultural, spiritual and religious values; their roots were imported from the West (just like the main leaders of the Bolshevik uprising for that matter). I would therefore argue that, in 1917, one type of Western elite (the aristocracy) was replaced by another type of Western elite (the Communist Party) and that both of them were "imports" and not "Russian intellectual products". I would even go further and argue that the Russian people, culture, and civilization have been persecuted for the last 300 years and that only with the

arrival of Vladimir Putin at the helm of the Russian state did this persecution end.

Let me immediately clarify that these past three centuries were not uniform and that some periods were better for the Russian people and some worse. I would submit that the period when Petr Stolypin was Prime Minister (1906-1911) was probably the best time for Russia. The worst times for the Russia happened only six years later when the Lenin-Trotsky gang seized power and immediately began indulging in a genocidal campaign against everything and anything "Russian" in the cultural, spiritual or intellectual sense (this bloody orgy only abated in 1938). All in all, even with very strong variations, I believe that in a cultural and spiritual sense, the Russian nation was oppressed to various degrees roughly between 1666 and 1999.

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great\\_Moscow\\_Synod](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great_Moscow_Synod))

That is 333 years - a long period by any standards.

And then there is modern Russia, which I call "New Russia". Clearly not the Russia of pre-1917, but not Soviet Russia either. And yet, a Russia which, for the first time in three centuries, is finally in the process of gradually shaking off Western cultural, political and socio-economic models, and which is trying to re-establish what I call the "Russian civilizational realm". Of course, we should not be naïve here: Putin inherited a political system entirely created by US "advisers" whose sole purpose was to further oppress and exploit the Russian people. The human and economic costs of the Gorbachev and Yeltsin years can only be compared to the effects of a major war. And yet, out of this horror, came a leader whose loyalty was solely to the Russian people and who set out to liberate Russia from her foreign oppressors. This process of "sovereignization" is far from completed and will probably take many years and go through many ups and downs, but it has undeniably been initiated and, for the first time in centuries, the

ruler of the Kremlin is not somebody whom the West can hope to subdue or coopt.

Hence the hysterical paranoia about Putin and his evil Russkies.

The West is terrified by the very real risk that for the first time in 333 years Russia might become truly Russian again.

A scary thought indeed.

Consider the record of what we can call "oppressed Russia". It began with the defeat by Peter I of one of the greatest European military powers, Sweden, during the Great Northern War (1700-1721) ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great\\_Northern\\_War](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Great_Northern_War)). If you are interested, take a look at this Wikipedia list of Russian wars between 1721 and 1917

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_wars\\_involving\\_Russia#Russian\\_Empire\\_.281721.E2.80.931917.29](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_wars_involving_Russia#Russian_Empire_.281721.E2.80.931917.29))

and pay special attention to those wars listed as "defeat" for Russia and notice that with the exception of the Crimean War, the Russo-Japanese War and WWI, Russia won all of her relevant/important wars (wars in which Russia played a major role or had a major stake). I personally would not consider that Russia lost the war against Japan (neither do Japanese historians, by the way), and in the case of WWI, Russia basically self-destructed on the eve of victory. As for what I call the "Great Ecumenical War against Russia" (it united the Latins, the Anglicans, and the Ottoman Muslims together), I would call it an "ugly draw" whose worst consequences for Russia were soon mitigated. Contrast this with the really important war; the Napoleonic aggression on Russia in which Russia single-handedly defeated a coalition basically uniting all of Europe against Russia. Take a look at this photo of a monument at the location of the biggest battle of the war, the battle of Borodino, and check out the list of countries allied together against Russia:

<http://dxczjjuegupb.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/borodino-enemy-list-jpg.jpeg>

France  
Italy  
Naples  
Austria  
Bavaria  
Berg  
Saxony  
Westphalia  
Prussia  
Holland  
Spain  
Portugal  
Poland  
Switzerland  
German Confederation

Total: 20 nations  
Infantry: 145,000  
Cavalry: 40,000  
Canons: 1,000

That is 15 countries against Russia. There were fewer aggressors during the “Great Ecumenical War” but three out of four of those aggressors were not just countries, but entire empires: French Empire, British Empire, Ottoman Empire. Whether it is 15:1 countries of 3:1 empires, a pattern begins to emerge. And while, during WWII, only six countries participated in the initial invasion of the Soviet Union (Germany, Romania, Finland, Italy, Hungary, Slovakia) in reality there were numerous more or less “volunteer” units which joined in.

European unity at its best indeed.

Each time Europe gathered all her forces to finally defeat, subdue, conquer and assimilate Russia, Russia prevailed and only got bigger and stronger. That, despite being, in so many ways, a crippled Russia; torn apart by profound internal contradictions; ruled by elites which the Russian masses found uninspiring at best. True, individual Czars during these years were truly popular, but the regime, the order, was hardly one I would consider as popular or representative of the worldview and culture of the Russian masses. And yet Russia won. Over and over. Despite being weak.

Some will say that this is the long gone past; that the world is different today; that nobody in Europe thinks about these wars. But this is not true. For one thing, every one of those wars was accompanied by a frenzied Russia-bashing campaign in the media and literature and all these wars were represented as fought in the name of lofty European values and against the barbaric hordes from the savage East. And in the years when Russia was not the object of a military attack, she was always the object of economic sanctions under one pious pretext or another. King Solomon was right when he wrote: "*The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun*". Gradually and insidiously, the hatred and fear of Russia became part of the Western cultural identity. Considering how the West learned to fear a crippled and weakened Russia, can you imagine the terror a truly United Russia would inspire?

By the way, do you know what Putin's political party is called? "United Russia", of course.

Keep in mind that during these years Russia was ruled by a hopelessly pro-Western elite and that every Russian ruler from Peter I to Dmitry Medvedev, with the exception of Alexander III and Joseph Stalin, wanted to be accepted as an equal partner by the



West. But the Western elites had no use for a partner or an ally, what they wanted was a compliant slave.

Vladimir Putin has made it quite clear that he has no such plans at all.

Speaking of Putin, there is something else in his rule which makes him quite unique: his real power does not come from the Russian Constitution or from the fact that he is the commander in chief of the Russian military, intelligence and security forces. If that were really the case, then the Russian elites, which are still largely pro-western, would have found a way to topple him a long time ago, with the assistance of Uncle Sam if needed. No, his real power is in the undeniable fact that the Russian people recognize him not only as their leader but also as their representative, if you wish, at the helm of the Russian state and in international affairs. There is a personal trust, a personal political capital, that the Russian people have given Vladimir Putin which sets him aside from all other Russian political figures. This feeling is so strong that even a lot of former political opponents have now become his supporters and that those who still openly oppose him do that with a great deal of difficulty and personal discomfort.

This personal authority of Putin does not, however, extend to Medvedev or, even less so, to the Russian government. I would argue that the Russian government is largely unpopular, as is the Russian Duma, but the lack of viable alternatives to the power of the “United Russia” Party makes this lack of popularity almost irrelevant.

If we take the word “monarchy” in its original meaning as “power of one” and if we recall that many Czars were personally popular even when their regimes were not, we could say that Putin’s rule is a kind of very traditional Russian “neo-monarchy” and that Putin has found a way to combine the external forms of democracy with the internal characteristics of Russian monarchy.

Interestingly, the Chechen leader Ramzan Kadyrov has decided to create a personal guard for Vladimir Putin (you can read about this here: (<https://thesaker.is/ramzan-kadyrov-offers-putin-his-own-personal-volunteer-chechen-special-force/>) ). In order to comply with the law, these personal guards all resigned their commission and offered their services to Vladimir Putin as a person, not to the Russian President.

Needless to say, the so-called "Russian experts" in the West dismiss it all as being a sign of Putin's "authoritarian" rule and characterize him as a "strongman" at best and a "dictator" at worst. In truth, fear and hatred are very poor advisors and it is little wonder that they get it so wrong. But then, "Russian experts" are not paid to understand Russia, they are only paid to demonize her.

So where, or what is Russia today?

At this point in time, I would say that Russia is both a promise and a process. As a promise, she is very vague, there are numerous different ideas of what "real Russia" was or should be. She is an ideal which is more perceived than understood. As a process, Russia is much more unambiguous: de-colonization, sovereignization, resistance and the unapologetic proclamation of a unique, different, civilizational model. The days when Russians were mindlessly aping the West are apparently truly over. Some say that the future of Russia is in the South (Caucasus, Central-Asia, Middle-East, Indian subcontinent), some see the future of Russia in the East (Siberia and Far East Asia, especially China) while some see it in the North (Siberia, again, and the Arctic).

But nobody sees it in the West anymore.

Of course, this is not how many Europeans see Russia's intentions. The Poles and the Balts, especially, keep themselves awake at night with nightmares featuring a Russian invasion of a conventional or "hybrid" kind. This reminds me of a Russian joke

which goes like this: a man is walking down the street when a woman on the balcony suddenly screams “Help! This man is about to rape me!!!”. The baffled man looks up and says, “Lady, you are crazy. I have no intention of raping you. Besides, I am here in the street and you are above me on the balcony,” to which the woman replies, “Maybe, but I am about to come down!”. Just like this woman, the Poles and Balts may be moved by a deep sense of guilt mixed in with an old inferiority complex and are strenuously trying to convince themselves that Russia really badly wants to invade them. Russia, of course, has exactly zero need for more land, and even less need for the rabidly hostile and frankly psychotic population of these countries. In reality, the Russian plan for these countries is simple: simply buy the Baltic States and let the Poles and the Germans enjoy their traditional love-fest. From a Russian point of view, these countries and their people are not coveted prizes but useless liabilities.

In contrast, Russia cannot ignore the Ukraine, especially not a Nazi-occupied one. As for the rest of Europe, it will always remain an important economic market for Russia and a place Russians will enjoy visiting, especially southern Europe and the Mediterranean. The very last thing Russia needs is any kind of war, especially a useless and potentially dangerous one with the West. Finally, it is likely that Russia will seek to establish close relationships with those southern European countries which really never wanted to pursue any anti-Russian policies, especially Greece and Serbia. So, while not being a priority anymore, the West will never become irrelevant either.

The hardest and also the most interesting thing to try to guess is what Russia will become internally. Probably not a monarchy, at least not in the foreseeable future. A recent poll strongly suggests that a majority of Russians do not want to trade a democratic republican system for a monarchy

(<https://www.rt.com/politics/381968-democracy-tops-list-of-political/>). Besides, in a country where truly religious Orthodox Christians are a minority, a monarchy really would make little sense. The problem with the current system is that it is entirely based on the person of Vladimir Putin. In fact, I would argue that there is no "current system" at all. There is only one person, Vladimir Putin who, while immensely popular, has to deal with all of the many Russian problems in the "manual mode" – meaning personally. As soon as something escapes his personal attention things begin to go wrong. This is simply not a viable system. And just to make things worse, there is no credible successor to Putin in sight. Should something happen to Putin tomorrow morning the crisis hitting Russia would be huge. Add to this that Russians have a long history of good leaders succeeded by mediocre ones and you see how serious a threat the current "one man show" is for the Russian future. I would, therefore, argue that the development of a truly Russian political system (as opposed to an individual ruler) ought to be considered as one of the most important strategic priorities for those Russians who do not want their country, to yet again become a western colony. Alas, the struggle between the "Atlantic Integrationists" (the Medvedev people) and the "Eurasian Sovereignists" (the Putin people) leaves very little time for that kind of endeavor.

So yes, "Russia is back", but she is still very much wobbling on her feet, and unsure as to where to go next. Right now, her future depends on the fate of one man and that is exceedingly dangerous.



# How to Bring Down the Elephant in the Room

April 16, 2017

## **A painful, but necessary, clarification:**

### **Basement crazies:**

(<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article11811.htm>)

### **Neocons:**

(<http://www.veteransnewsnow.com/2016/11/27/1011511trump-the-great-paul-craig-roberts/>)

### **Zionists:**

(<https://web.archive.org/web/20121206052903/http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/761C1063530766A7052566A2005B74D1>)

### **Israeli Lobbyists:**

(<https://www.amazon.com/Israel-Lobby-U-S-Foreign-Policy/dp/0374531501>)

### **Judaics:**

(<http://www.dictionary.com/browse/judaic>)

### **Jews:**

(<https://www.amazon.com/Wandering-Who-Gilad-Atzmon/dp/1846948754/>)

Somewhere along this list we bump into the proverbial "elephant in the room". For some, this bumping will happen earlier in the list, for others a little later down the list, but the list will be more or less the same for everybody. Proper etiquette, as least in the West, would want to make us run away from that topic. I won't. Why? Well, for one thing, I am constantly accused of not discussing this elephant. Furthermore, I am afraid that the role

this elephant is playing is particularly toxic right now. So let me try to deal with this beast; but first I have to begin with some caveats.

### **First, terminology:**

For those who have not seen it, please read my article "Why I use the term AngloZionist and why it is important." (<https://thesaker.is/why-i-use-the-term-anglozionist-and-why-its-important/>)

Then, please read my friend Gilad Atzmon's article "Jews, Judaism & Jewishness"

(<http://www.gilad.co.uk/writings/gilad-atzmon-jews-judaism-jewishness.html>)

(or, even better, please read his seminal book "The Wandering Who

(<https://www.amazon.com/Wandering-Who-Gilad-Atzmon/dp/1846948754/>)).

Please note that Gilad specifically excludes Judaics (religious Jews,) from his discussion. He writes: "I do not deal with Jews as a race or an ethnicity. I also generally avoid dealing with Judaism (the religion)". I very much include them in my discussion. However, I also fully agree with Gilad when he writes that "Jews Are Not a Race, But Jewish Identity is Racist"

(<http://www.gilad.co.uk/writings/jews-are-not-a-race-but-jewish-identity-is-racist.html>)

(those having any doubts about Jews not being a race or ethnicity should read Shlomo Sand's excellent book "The Invention of the Jewish People"

(<https://www.amazon.com/Invention-Jewish-People-Shlomo-Sand/dp/1844676234/>)).

Lastly, please carefully review my definition of racism as spelled out in my "moderation policies"

(<http://thesaker.is/moderation-policy/>):

**“Racism is, in my opinion, not so much the belief that various human groups are different from each other, say like dog breeds can be different, but the belief that the differences between human groups are larger than within the group. Second, racism is also a belief that the biological characteristics of your group somehow predetermine your actions/choices/values in life. Third, racism often, but not always, assumes a hierarchy amongst human groups (Germanic Aryans over Slavs or Jews, Jews over Gentiles, etc.). I believe that God created all humans with the same purpose and that we are all "brothers in Adam", that we all equally share the image (eternal and inherent potential for perfection) of God (as opposed to our likeness to Him, which is our temporary and changing individual condition).**

To sum it all up, I need to warn both racists and rabid anti-anti-Zionists that I will disappoint them both: the object of my discussion and criticism below will be limited to categories which a person chooses to belong to or endorse (religion, political ideas, etc.) and not categories with which one is born with (race, ethnicity).

Second, so what are Jews if not a race? In my opinion, they are a tribe (which Oxford Dictionaries defines as: *a social division in a traditional society consisting of families or communities linked by social, economic, religious, or blood ties, with a common culture and dialect, typically having a recognized leader*). A tribe is a group one can choose to join (Elizabeth Taylor) or leave (Gilad Atzmon).

Third, Jews are a tribe to which we who are non-Jews owe exactly nothing; no special status, neither bad nor good; no special privilege of any kind; no special respect or “sensitivity” – nothing at all. We ought to treat Jews exactly as we treat any other of our fellow human beings: “*as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise*” (Luke 6:31). So if being Jewish is a choice and if any choice is a legitimate object of discussion and criticism, then being Jewish is a legitimate object of discussion and criticism. Conversely, those who would deny us the right to criticize Jews are, of course, the real racists since they believe that Jews somehow deserve a special status. In fact, that notion is at the core of the entire Jewish identity and ideology.

Now let's come back to our opening list: Basement crazies. Neocons. Zionists. Israeli Lobbyists. Judaics. Jews. I submit that these are all legitimate categories as long as it is clear that “Jews by birth only”; what Alain Soral in France calls “the everyday Jews”; are not included in this list. Thus, for our purposes and in this context, these terms are all interchangeable. My own preference still goes for “Zionist” because it combines the ideological racism of secular Jews (<https://web.archive.org/web/20121206052903/http://unispal.un.org/UNISPAL.NSF/0/761C1063530766A7052566A2005B74D1>) with the religious racism of Judaics (<https://www.radioislam.org/islam/english/toread/jewras.htm>) (if you don't like my choice, just replace "Zionist" with any of the categories I listed above). Zionism used to be secular, but it turned religious during the late 20th century, so now, for our purposes, this term can encompass both secular and religious Jewish supremacists. Add to this some more or less conservative opinions and mindsets and you have "Ziocons" as an alternative expression.



[Sidebar: This tells you something about the power of the Zionist propaganda machine; I call it the "Ziomedial." Perhaps I should preface this article with 700+ explanatory words to try to overcome counter conditioned mental reflexes in the reader to infer that I might be an evil anti-Semite. By the way, I am under no illusions either; some Jews or *doubleplusgoodthinking* shabbos-goyim will still accuse me of racism. This just comes with the territory. But the good news is that when I challenge them to prove their accusation, they will walk away empty-handed].

The reason I decided to tackle this issue today is that the forces who broke Trump in less than a month (<http://thesaker.is/the-neocons-and-the-deep-state-have-neutered-the-trump-presidency-its-over-folks/>) are also the very same forces responsible for his political 180: the Neocons and the US deep state. However, I think that these two concepts can be fused into what I and others have called the "Ziocons": basically Zionists plus some rabid Anglo imperialists *à la* Cheney and McCain. Ziocons are the folks who control the US corporate media, Hollywood, Congress, most of the academia, etc. These are the folks who organized a ferocious assault on the "nationalist" or "patriotic" wing of Trump supporters and ousted Flynn and Bannon, and these are the folks who basically staged a color revolution against Trump (<http://thesaker.is/a-color-revolution-is-under-way-in-the-united-states/>). There is some pretty good evidence that the person in charge of this quiet coup is Jared Kushner, a rabid Zionist (<http://mondoweiss.net/2017/01/jared-kushner-israel/>).  
Maybe

(<http://www.mintpressnews.com/the-prodigo-son-in-law-jared-kushner-and-the-rise-of-the-neo-cons-in-the-trump-admin/226794/>).

Maybe not.

This does not really matter; what matters now is to understand what this all means for the rest of us in the “basket of deplorables”, the “99%ers” – basically the rest of the planet.

## **Making sense of the crazies**

Making sense of the motives and goals (one cannot speak of “logic” in this case) of self-deluded racists can be a difficult exercise. But when the “basement crazies” (reminder: this term was first used here:

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article11811.htm>)

are basically in control of the policies of the US Empire, this becomes a crucial, vital exercise for the survival of the mentally sane. I will now try to outline the reasons behind the “new” Trump policies using two examples: Syria and Russia.

Syria. I think that we can all agree that having the black flag of Daesh fly over Damascus would be a disaster for Israel. Right? Wrong! You are thinking like a mentally sane person. This is not how the Israelis think at all. For them, Daesh is much preferable to Assad, not only because Assad is the cornerstone of a unitary Syria, but because Daesh in power gives the Israelis the perfect pretext to establish a “security zone” to “protect” northern Israel. And that, in plain English, means fully occupying and annexing the Golan (a longstanding Israeli dream). Even better, the Israelis know Daesh really well (they helped create it with the USA and Saudi Arabia) and they know that Daesh is a mortal threat to Hezbollah. By putting Daesh into power in Syria, the Israelis hope for a long, bloody and never-

ending war in Lebanon and Syria. While their northern neighbors would be plugged into a maelstrom of atrocities and horrors, the Israelis would get to watch it all from across their border while sending a few aircraft from time to time to bomb Hezbollah positions or even innocent civilians under whatever pretext. Remember how the Israelis watched in total delight while their forces bombed the population of Gaza in 2014?

(<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/jul/20/israelis-cheer-gaza-bombing>)

With Daesh in power in Damascus, they would get an even better show to take their kids to watch. Finally, and last but definitely not least, the Syrian Christians would be basically completely wiped out. For those who know the hatred Jews and Jews have always felt for Christianity

(<http://www.haaretz.com/christians-in-jerusalem-want-jews-to-stop-spitting-on-them-1.137099>), even today, it will be clear why the Israelis would want Daesh in power in Syria: Daesh is basically a tool to carve up an even bigger Zionist entity.

Russia. Zionists, especially ex-Trotskyists turned Neocons, absolutely loathe Russia and everything Russian. I have explained the origins of this hatred elsewhere (<https://thesaker.is/how-a-medieval-concept-of-ethnicity-makes-nato-commit-yet-another-a-dangerous-blunder/>), so I won't repeat it all here. You just need to study the genocidal policies against anything Russian of the first Bolshevik government (which was 80%-85% Jews. Don't believe me? Then listen to Putin himself

(<https://youtu.be/j6p1zxKnDeM>)). I have already discussed "The ancient spiritual roots of Russophobia" in a past article

(<https://thesaker.is/the-ancient-spiritual-roots-of-russophobia/>)

and I have also explained what rabbinical Phariseism (what is mistakenly called "Judaism" nowadays) is little more than an "anti-Christianity"

(<http://thesaker.is/off-topic-but-apparently-needed-judaism-and-christianity-back-to-basics/comment-page-2/> )

(Please read those articles if this complex and fascinating history is of interest to you). The bottom line is this: modern Neocons are little else than former Trotskyists who have found a new host to use. Their hatred for everything Russian is still so visceral that they would rather support *bona fide* Nazis (isn't this ironic?) in the Ukraine than Russia, which is even more paradoxical if you recall that before the 1917 Bolshevik coup, anti-Jewish feelings were much stronger in what is today the Ukraine than in what is the Russian Federation today. In fact, relations between Russians and Jews have, I would argue, been significantly improving since the Nazi coup in Kiev, much to the chagrin of the relatively few Russians left who truly hate Jews. Even though you will hear a lot of criticism of organized political Jewry in Russia, especially compared to the West, there is very little true anti-Jewish racism in Russia today, and even less publicly expressed in the media (in fact, 'hate speech' is illegal in Russia). One thing to keep in mind is that there are many substantial differences between Russian Jews and US Jews, especially among those Russian Jews who deliberately chose not to emigrate to Israel, or some other western country (those interested in this topic can find a more detailed discussion here

(<http://thesaker.is/putin-and-israel-a-complex-and-multi-layered-relationship/>).

Jews in Russia today deliberately chose to stay and that, right there, shows a very different attitude than the earlier attitude of those (Jews and non-Jews) who took their first opportunity to get out of Russia as soon as possible. Bottom line – Ziocons feel an overwhelming and always present hatred for Russia and Russians and that factor is one of the key components of their motivations. Unless you take that hatred into account you will

never be able to make sense of the Ziocons and their demented policies.

## **Making sense of Trump**

I think that Trump can be criticized for a lot of things, but there is exactly zero evidence of him ever harboring anti-Russian feelings. There is plenty of evidence that he has always been pro-Israel, but no more than any politician or businessman in the USA. I doubt that Trump even knows where the Golan Heights are. He probably also does not know that Hezbollah and Daesh are mortal enemies. Yes, Trump is a poorly educated ignoramus who is much better suited to the shows in Las Vegas than to be President of a nuclear superpower, but I don't see any signs of him being hateful of anybody. More generally, the guy is really not ideological. The best evidence is his goofy idea of building a wall to solve the problem of illegal immigration: he (correctly) identified a problem, but then he came up with a Kindergarten level (pseudo) solution. The same goes for his views on Russia. He probably figured out something along these lines: "Putin is a strong guy; Russia is a strong country; they hate Daesh and want to destroy it – let's join forces". The poor man apparently had absolutely no idea of the power and maniacal drive of the Neocons who met him once he entered the White House. Even worse is the fact that he apparently does not realize that they are now using him to try out some pretty demented policies for which they will later try to impeach him as the sole culprit, should things go wrong (and they most definitely will). Frankly, I get the feeling that Trump was basically sincere in his desire to "drain the swamp" but that he is simply not too clever (just the way he betrayed Flynn and Bannon to try to appease the Ziocons is so self-defeating and, frankly, stupid). But even if I am wrong and Trump was "their" plant all

along (I still don't believe that at all), the end result is the same: we now have the Ziocons in total control of BOTH parties in Congress (or, more accurately, both wings of the Ziocon party in Congress), in total control of the White House, the mass media, and Hollywood. I am not so sure that they truly are in control of the Pentagon, but when I see the kind of pliable and spineless military figures Trump has recently appointed, I get the feeling that there are only two types of officers left in the top ranks of the US military: retired ones and "ass-kissing little chickenshits" à la Petraeus

([http://www.correntewire.com/centcom\\_chief\\_admiral\\_fallon\\_petraeus\\_an\\_ass\\_kissing\\_little\\_chickenshit](http://www.correntewire.com/centcom_chief_admiral_fallon_petraeus_an_ass_kissing_little_chickenshit)).

Not good. Not good at all. As for the ridiculously bloated (and therefore mostly incompetent) "three letter agencies soup", it appears that it has been turned from an intelligence community to a highly politicized propaganda community whose main purpose is to justify whatever counter-factual insanity their political bosses can dream up. Again. Not good. Not good at all.

### **Living with ZOG :-)**

ZOG or "Zionist Occupation Government". That used to be the favorite expression of various Jew-haters out there and its use was considered the surefire sign of a rabid anti-Semite. And yet, that is precisely what we are now all living with: a Zionist occupation government which has clearly forced Trump to make a 180 on all his campaign promises and which now risks turning the USA into a radioactive desert resulting from a completely artificial and needless confrontation with Russia. To those horrified that I would dare use an expression like ZOG, I will reply in this way: believe me, I am even more upset than you are about having to admit that ZOG is real; I really don't care for racists of any kind,

and most of these ZOG folks look like real racists to me. But, alas, they are also right! Facts are facts. You cannot deny them or refuse to correctly qualify them because of the possible “overtones” of the term chosen or because of some invented need to be especially “sensitive” when dealing with some special group. Remember – Jews are not owed any special favor and there is no need to constantly engage in various forms of complex linguistic or mental yoga contortions when discussing them and their role in the modern world. Still, I am using ZOG here just to show that it can be done, but this is not my favorite expression. I just feel that committing the *crimethink* here will encourage others to come out of their shell and speak freely. At the very least, simply asking the question of whether we do or do not have a Zionist Occupation Government is an extremely important exercise. Hence, for today, I ZOG-away :-)

Some might argue with the "occupation" part of the label. Okay – what would you call a regime which is clearly acting in direct opposition to the will of an overwhelming majority of its citizens, and which acts in the interests of a foreign power (with which the USA does not even have a formal treaty)? Because, please make no mistake here, this is not a Trump-specific phenomenon. I think that it all began with Reagan and that the Ziocons fully seized power with Bill Clinton. Others think that it all began with Kennedy. Whatever may be the case **during election after election Americans consistently vote for less war and each time around they get more wars.** It is true that most Americans are mentally unable to conceptually analyze the bizarre phenomena of a country with no enemies and formidable natural barriers that spends more on wars of aggression than the rest of the planet spends on defense. Nor are they equipped to wonder why the US needs 16/17 intelligence agencies when the vast majority of countries out there do fine with less than 5. Lastly, most

Americans do believe that they have some kind of duty to police the planet. True. But *at the same time*, they are also sick and tired of wars, if only because so many of their relatives, friends, and neighbors return from these wars either dead or crippled. That, and the fact that Americans absolutely hate losing. Losing is all the USA has been doing since God knows how long: losing wars against all but the weakest and most defenseless countries out there. Most Americans also would prefer that the money spent abroad on “defending democracy” (i.e. imperialism) be spent at home to help the millions of Americans in dire need in the USA. As the southern rock band Lynyrd Skynyrd (who hails from Jacksonville, Florida) once put it in their songs “Things goin’ on” ([https://youtu.be/jb\\_8e7wUipM](https://youtu.be/jb_8e7wUipM)):

*Too many lives they've spent across the ocean  
Too much money has been spent upon the moon  
Well, until they make it right  
I hope they never sleep at night  
They better make some changes  
And do it soon*

Soon? That song was written in 1978! And since then, nothing has changed. If anything, things have become far worse.

## **Houston, we got a problem**

ZOG is not an American problem. It is a planetary problem, if only because right now ZOG controls the US nuclear arsenal. And Trump, who clearly and unequivocally campaigned on a peace platform, is now sending a “very powerful armada”



(<http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/trumps-%E2%80%98very-powerful-armada%E2%80%99-its-way-korea-about-get-even-20141>)

to the coast of the DPRK. Powerful as this armada might be, it can do absolutely nothing to prevent the DPRK artillery from smashing Seoul into smithereens. You think that I am exaggerating? Business Insider estimated in 2010 that it would take the DPRK 2 hours to completely obliterate Seoul.

(<http://www.businessinsider.com/map-of-the-day-how-north-korea-could-destroy-seoul-in-two-hours-2010-5>)

Why? Because the DPRK has enough artillery pieces to fire 500,000 rounds of artillery on Seoul in the first hour of a conflict. That's why.

(<http://www.businessinsider.com/why-no-one-in-korea-wants-war-2013-4>).

Here we are talking about old-fashioned, conventional, artillery pieces. Wikipedia says

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Korean\\_People%27s\\_Army\\_Ground\\_Force](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Korean_People%27s_Army_Ground_Force))

that the DPRK has 8,600 artillery pieces and 4,800 multiple rocket launcher systems. Two days ago a Russian expert said that the real figure was just under 20,000 artillery pieces. Whatever the exact figure, suffice to say that it is “a lot”.

The DPRK also has some more modern but equally dangerous capabilities.

(<http://nationalinterest.org/feature/5-north-korean-weapons-south-korea-should-fear-14825>)

Of special importance here are the roughly 200,000 North Korean special forces. Oh sure, these 200,000 are not US Green Beret or Russian Spetsnaz, but they are adequate for their task: to operate deep behind enemy lines and create chaos and destroy key objectives. You tell me – what can the USS Carl Vinson carrier

strike group deploy against these well hidden and dispersed 10,000+ artillery pieces and 200,000 special forces? Exactly; nothing at all.

### **And did I mention that the DPRK has nukes?**

No, I did not. First, I am not at all sure that the kind of nukes the DPRK has can be fitted for delivery on a missile. Having a few nukes and having missiles is one thing, having missiles capable of adequately delivering these nukes is quite another. I suppose that DPRK Special Forces could simply drive a nuke down near Seoul on a run-of-the-mill army truck and blow it up. Or bring it on a container ship somewhere in the general vicinity of a US or Korean base and blow it up. One neat trick would be to load a nuke on a civilian ship, say a fishing vessel, and bring it somewhere near the USS Carl Vinson and then blow it up. Even if the USN ships survive this unscathed, the panic aboard these ships would be total. To be honest, this is mostly Tom Clancy stuff; in real warfare, I don't think that the North Korean nukes would be very useful against a US attack. But you never know — necessity is the mother of invention, as the British like to say.

I don't believe that Trump is dumb enough to actually strike at North Korea. I think that his dumbass plan is probably to shoot down a DPRK missile to show that he has made "America great again" or something equally asinine. The problem here is that I am not sure at all how Kim Jong-un and his Party minions might react to that kind of loss of face. What if they decided that they needed to fire some more missiles, some in the general direction of US forces in the region (there are fixed US targets all over the place). Then what? How will Trump prove that he is the biggest dog on the block? Could he decide to "punish" the offending missile

launch site like he did with the al-Sharyat airbase in Syria? And if Trump does that – what will Kim Jong-un’s reaction be?

To be candid, I don’t think that the “very powerful armada” will do anything other than waste the US taxpayer’s money. I am getting a strong sense that Trump is all about appearance over substance, what the Russians call “показыха” – a kind of fake show of force, full of special effects and “cool” photo ops, but lacking any real substance. Still, being on the receiving end of Trump’s показыха (po-kah-zoo-kha) must be unnerving, especially if you already have natural paranoid tendencies. I am not at all sure that Kim Jong-un will find the presence of the US carrier strike group as pathetic and useless as I do.

Both Russia and Syria have shown an amazing amount of restraint when provoked by Turkey or the US. This is mostly due to the fact that Russian and Syrian leaders are well-educated people who are less concerned with loss of face than with achieving their end result. In direct contrast, both Kim Jong-un and Trump are weak, insecure, leaders with an urgent need to prove to their people (and to themselves!) that they are tough guys. Exactly the most dangerous kind of mindset you want in any nuclear-capable power, be it huge like the USA or tiny like the DPRK.

## **So what does that have to do with the ZOG and the Ziocons?**

Everything.

They are the ONLY ONES who really want to maintain the AngloZionst Empire at any cost. Trump made it clear over and over again that his priority was the USA and the American people, not the Empire. And yet now he is playing a crazy game of “nuclear chicken” with the DPRK. Does that sound like the “real Trump” to you? Maybe – but not to me. All this crazy stuff around the DPRK

and the (few) nukes it apparently has, is all just a pretext to “play empire”, to show that, as Obama liked to say, the USA is the “indispensable nation“

(<https://www.rt.com/usa/365445-obama-humility-america-indispensable/>).

God forbid the local countries would deal with that problem alone, without USN carrier strike groups involved in the “solving” of this problem!

[Sidebar: by the way, this is also the exact same situation in Syria: the Russians have single-handedly organized a viable peace process on the ground and then followed it up with a multi-party conference in Astana, Kazakhstan. Looks great except for one problem: the indispensable nation was not even invited. Even worse, the prospects of peace breaking out became terribly real. The said indispensable nation, therefore “invited itself” by illegally (and ineffectually) bombing a Syrian air base and, having now proven its capacity to wreck any peace process. The USA is now right back in center-stage of the negotiations about the future of Syria. In a perverse way, this almost makes sense.]

So yes, we have a problem and that problem is that ZOG is in total control of the Empire and will never accept to let it go, even if that means destroying the USA in the process.

I can imagine the gasp of horror and disgust some of you will have at seeing me use the ZOG expression. I assure you, it is quite deliberate on my part. I want to: 1) wake you up and 2) show you that you cannot allow the discomfort created by conditioning to guide your analyses. As with all the other forms of *crimethink*, I

recommend that you engage in a lot of it, preferably in public, and you will get used to it. First, it will be hard, but with time it will get easier (it is also great fun). Furthermore, somebody needs to be the first one to scream: "the emperor has no clothes" (<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=the%20emperor%20has%20no%20clothes>)

Then, once one person does it, the others realize that it is safe and more follow. The key thing here is not to allow ideological "sacred cows" to roam around your intellectual mind space and limit you in your thinking. Dogmas should be limited to Divine revelations, not human ideological constructs.

### **Where do we go from here?**

Things are coming to a head. Trump presented himself as a real alternative to the ultimate warmongering shabbos-shiksa Hillary. It is now pretty darn obvious that what we now have is just another puppet, but that the puppet-masters have not changed. The good news is that those who were sincere in their opposition to war are now openly speaking about Trump's great betrayal. From Ann Coulte

(<https://youtu.be/GdPGfUTLrFg>)

to Pat Buchanan

(<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/46839.htm>),

many paleo-Conservatives clearly "got it." As did the real progressives

([http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/donald\\_trump\\_surrenders\\_to\\_the\\_war\\_party\\_20170415](http://www.truthdig.com/report/item/donald_trump_surrenders_to_the_war_party_20170415)). What we are left with is what I call the "extreme center", basically zombies who get their news from the Ziomeia and who have so many mental blocks that it takes weeks of focused efforts to basically bring them back to reality.

The key issue here is how do we rescue those who are still capable of clear thinking? I think that a minimalist agenda we can all agree upon could be composed of the following points:

1. Peace/pacifism
2. International law
3. Human and civil rights
4. Democracy
5. Pluralism
6. Anti-racism
7. Ethics and morality

Sounds harmless? It ain't, I assure you. ZOG can only survive by violence, terror, and war. Furthermore, the AngloZionist Empire cannot abide by any principles of international law. As for human and civil rights, one quick look at the Patriot Act (which was already ready by the time the 9/11 false flag operation was executed) will tell you how ZOG feels about these issues. More proof? How about the entire "fake news" canard? How about the new levels of censorship on YouTube, Facebook or Google? Don't you see that this is simply a frontal attack on free speech and the First Amendment?! What about Black Lives Matter – is that not a perfect pretext to justify more police powers and a further militarization of police forces? To think that the Zionists care about human or civil rights is a joke! Just read what the Uber-Zionist and [putative] human rights lawyer, the great Alan Dershowitz writes about torture, Israel or restriction of free speech (especially for Norman Finkelstein). Heck, just read what ultra-liberal super-mega human righter (well, after he returned to civilian life) and ex-President Jimmy Carter writes about Israel! (<https://www.amazon.com/Palestine-Peace-Apartheid-Jimmy-Carter/dp/0743285034/>)

Or look at the policies of the Bolshevik regime in Russia. It is pretty clear that these guys not only don't give a damn about

human or civil rights but that they are deeply offended and outraged when they are told that they cannot violate these rights.

What about democracy? How can that be an intellectual weapon? Simple – you show that every time the people (in the USA or Europe) voted for X they got Y. Or they were told to re-vote and re-vote and re-vote again and again until, finally, the Y won. That is a clear lack of democracy. So if you say that you want to restore democracy, you are basically advocating regime-change, but nicely wrapped into a “good” ideological wrapper. Western democracies are profoundly anti-democratic. Show it!

Pluralism? Same deal. All this takes is to prove that the western society has become a “mono-ideological” society where real dissent is simply not tolerated and where real pluralism is completely absent from public discourse. Demand that the enemies of the system be given equal time on air and always make sure that you give the supporters of the system equal time on media outlets you (we) control. Then ask them to compare. This is exactly what Russia is doing nowadays (see Chapter 16 if you are interested). Western democracies are profoundly anti-pluralistic. Again, show it!

Anti-racism. Should be obvious to the reader by now. Denounce, reject and attack any idea that gives any group any special status. Force your opponents to fess up to the fact that what they *really* want when they claim to struggle for “equality” is a special status for their single-issue minority. Reject any and all special interest groups and, especially, reject the notion that democracy is about defending the minority against the majority. In reality, minorities are always much more driven and motivated by a single issue; that is why a coalition of minorities inevitably comes to power. What the world needs is the exact opposite: a democracy that would protect the majority against the minorities. Oh, sure, they will fight you on this one, but since you

are right this is an intellectual argument you ought to be capable of winning pretty easily (just remember, don't let accusations of *crimethink* freeze you in terror).

Lastly, my favorite one: ethics and morality. Modern Western society has been built on a categorical rejection of ethics and morality. Slogans like "God is dead" or "Beyond good and evil" resulted in the most abject and viciously evil century in human history: the 20th century. Furthermore, most people by now can tell that Hollywood, and its closely related spinoff, the US porn industry, have played a central role in basically removing categories such as "good," "truth," and "honor" from the mind of those infected by the US mass media, especially the Idiot-box (aka "telescreen" in Orwell's 1984). Instead, unbridled greed and consumption became the highest and most sacred expression of "our way of life" as Americans like to say. Hollywood movies effectively proclaim that "greed is good."

(<https://youtu.be/VVxYOQS6ggk>) In fact, at the very core of capitalist ideology is the belief that the sum total of everybody's greed yields the happiest and most successful society possible. Crazy and sick stuff, but I don't have room to discuss this here. All I will say is that rehabilitating the notions of right and wrong, good and evil, truth and falsehood, healthy and natural versus unnatural and pathological is a great legal way (at least so far) to fight the Empire. Ditto for sexual morality and family. There is a reason why Hollywood movies frequently present only divorced or sexually promiscuous heroes: they are trying to destroy the natural family unit because they \*correctly\* identify the traditional family unit as a threat to the AngloZionist order. Likewise, there is also a reason why all the western elites are constantly plagued by accusations of pedophilia and other sexual scandals. One Russian commentator, Vitalii Tretiakov, recently paraphrased the old communist slogan and declared "naturals of all countries – come



to Russia” [in modern Russian “naturals” is the antonym of “homosexual”). He was joking, of course, but he was also making a serious point: Russia has become the only country that dares to openly uphold the core values of Christianity and Islam (that, of course, only adds to the Ziocon’s hatred of Russia).

[Sidebar: By the way, and contrary to popular belief, Russia is not an especially religious country at all. Although only a minority of Russians are truly religious, a majority of Russians seem to support religious values as civilizational ones. I don't think that this is sustainable for too long; Russia likely will become more religious, or more secularized, but for the time being, we have this apparently paradoxical situation of a generally secular society standing for traditional and religious values]

You might wonder how pacifism, international law, human and civil rights, democracy, pluralism, anti-racism, ethics, and morality can help avert a nuclear war in Korea. In truth – they cannot directly do this. But in the long term, I firmly believe that these values can corrode the AngloZionist Empire from within. And look at the alternatives: Organizing political parties does not work in a system where money determines the outcome. "Direct action" does not work in a system that treats libertarians and ecologists as potential terrorists. Public protests do not work in a regime where the Ziomedias get to decide which demonstration gets coverage and which one does not. Civil disobedience does not work in a regime that has no problem having the highest per capita incarceration rate on the planet. Running for office does not work in a regime that selects for spinelessness, immorality and, above all, subservience. Even running away abroad does not work when

dealing with an Empire which has 700-1000 (depending on how you count) military bases worldwide that will bomb the crap out of any government that strives for even a modicum of true sovereignty. The only other option is "internal exile," whereby you build yourself your own inner world of spiritual and intellectual freedom where you basically "live there" with no external signs of you having "fled" the Empire's ugly reality. But if nuclear-tipped ICBMs start flying, no amount of "internal exile" will protect you, not even if you combine that internal exile with a life far away in the boonies.

Orthodox Christian eschatology teaches that the "End Times" are inevitable. However, the Fathers also teach that we can push the End Times back by our collective actions, be it in the form of prayers or in the form of an open resistance to Evil in our world. I have three children, 1 girl, and 2 boys, and I feel I owe it to them to fight to make the world they will have to live in even marginally better. And even if all my efforts are in vain, at least I know that I resisted with everything I have. At the very least, I hope that it will inspire them to fight for their own children. I also believe that I have to resist this Empire because of all the good, decent and kind people I met in my life, including the Americans I have been living next to for so many years now. I don't want any of them to die in a useless and stupid war triggered by the demented minds of a tiny demonic minority of mankind-hating psychopaths who, driven by their apparently infinite capacity for evil and self-delusion, apparently having convinced themselves that either they will own the planet or they will destroy it.

Saint Paul very accurately explained that *"For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places"* (Ephesians 6:12). As for Ernesto Che

Guevara, he wrote that "*the true revolutionary is guided by a great feeling of love*" (love of living humanity)

(<https://www.marxists.org/archive/guevara/1965/03/man-socialism.htm>). Today is Holy Paskha (<http://thesaker.is/today-is-holy-paskha-christ-is-risen/>), the most joyful and sacred day in the Orthodox year, the day that marks the victory of Christ even against death itself! In the beautiful words of Saint John Chrysostomos (<https://thesaker.is/bright-resurrection-of-christ-holy-paskha/>):

*"O Death, where is your sting? O Hell, where is your victory? Christ is risen, and you are overthrown. Christ is risen, and the demons are fallen. Christ is risen, and the angels rejoice. Christ is risen, and life reigns. Christ is risen, and not one dead remain in the grave."*

These words and this promise should give us the courage to resist no matter how ugly, evil and insane the world around us can become. Because we do not struggle against flesh and blood, but against wickedness in high places, and because we are not moved by hatred, but by the love for our fellow human being. Finally, the following words written by a true Jew several millennia ago will, I hope, give us all the courage to struggle until our victory: "*I will not be afraid of ten thousands of people, who beset me round about. Arise, Lord; deliver me, my God: for thou hast smitten all who were without cause mine enemies; thou hast broken the teeth of sinners. Deliverance is the Lord's, and thy blessing is upon thy people*" (Ps. 3).

I greet you all with the ancient Christian greeting of *Christ is Risen!*

PS: I pretty much know what to expect next. First, some will make me say things I never said by beginning their dishonest

paraphrase with the words “in other words...” and then fill the blank with stuff I never said. Others will try to summarize these 6300+ words of long text in a one line slogan that will grossly misrepresent my analysis. I won't ask the moderators to ban such posts, but I warn you that the use of either one of these techniques will guarantee that I will ignore your post. Likewise, I have included a lot of pointers to outside texts and sources, and if you failed to read them and that shows in your comment, I will likewise ignore your comments. You have been forewarned ;-)



# Why Voting for Trump was the Right Thing to Do (7 Reasons)

April 21, 2017

Now that Trump has already comprehensively betrayed all his campaign promises and that his 100 first days in office are marked by nothing else but total chaos, incompetence, betrayals of his closest friends and allies, recklessly dangerous and utterly ineffective grandstanding in foreign policy, there are a lot of people out there who say "I told you so!", "how could you take this clown seriously!" and "are you now finally waking up from your delusional state?". Yes, a superficial survey of what Trump did since he got into the White House could appear to make these nay-sayers look right. But in reality, they are completely wrong. Let me explain why.

First, what these nay-sayers apparently ignore is that there are innumerable examples in history of the elites turning against each other, usually in times of crises. In the case of Trump, I submit that there is overwhelming empirical data out there that a good part of the world elites really and truly were terrified of a possible Trump victory. The kind of hysterical, completely over-the-top hate campaign in which the US Ziomeia engaged against Trump is something which I have never seen before and which, in my opinion, proves that the Neocon-run propaganda outlets (the Ziomeia, Hollywood) saw Trump as a major danger to their interests. Now, whether Trump had any chance against such powerful "deep state" actors or not is immaterial: Trump was a chance, a possibility, and, I would argue, the only option to try to kick the Neocons in the teeth. And don't give me Sanders or Stein

as possible options, they were both 100% fake – just look at how both of them did Hillary's dirty job for her (Sanders with his endorsement of her even though he was cheated out of a victory and Stein with her ridiculous recount). Even if Trump had just a 1% chance of prevailing, voting for him was an opportunity to achieve regime change in the USA and the American people grabbed it. They did the ethically and pragmatically correct thing. Trump was really the only choice.

Second, you can think of the elections as a giant opinion poll. What the American voter did is to send two messages *urbi et orbi*. First to the rest of the planet: *Not in our name! We don't support this regime!* And then to the Neocons: *we hate you. In fact, we hate you so much that we are willing to even vote for a guy like Trump just because we hate Hillary even more.* As to the message to the Ziomeia it was crystal clear: *liars! We don't trust you! Go screw yourselves, we will vote for the man you hate with such a passion precisely because we deny you the right to tell us what to think.* Yes, Trump proved to be a fake and a liar himself, but he will also be a one term President as a direct consequence of his betrayals. And it is quite possible that Kushner or Pence will now run the Empire on behalf of his real bosses, but the world will also know that this was not what the American people wanted.

Third, this gigantic vote of no-confidence in the Ziomeia will now force the regime to engage in all sorts of more or less subtle maneuvers to try to crack down on free speech in the USA. This is good news for two reasons: a) they will fail and b) they will show their true face. YouTube, Google, Facebook, Twitter and all the others are now becoming overt agents of oppression whereas in the past they still had (an admittedly thin) veneer of respectability. Now that it has become clear that the Internet is the last free-speech zone and that more and more Americans realize that Russia Today or Press TV are far superior news sources than the US

Ziomeia, the level of influence of the US propaganda machine will continue to plummet.

Fourth, if we look at the immoral, self-defeating and, frankly, stupid decisions of Trump in the Middle-East and in Far-East Asia we can at least find some solace in the fact that Trump is now betraying all his campaign promises. Hillary would have done more or less the same, but she would have definitely presented these policies as having a mandate from the American people. Trump has no such excuse, and that is very good indeed. Voting for Trump took the mandate away from the Ziocons.

Fifth, remember the "basket of deplorables"? "Racist, sexist, homophobic, xenophobic, Islamophobic?" If Hillary had been elected, then the ideology which made her characterize the average American as an ugly bigot would be ruling the country by now. But she was defeated. Thus, it is becoming undeniable that there are two Americas out there: one which I call the "alliance of minorities" and the other what I would call "real America" or "mainstream America". The defeat of Hillary has sent a powerful message to these minorities reminding them that they are exactly that – minorities – and that a political agenda centered on the hatred of the majority is not a viable one. This empowering of the majority of US Americans is, I think, a much-needed development whose effects will hopefully be felt in future elections.

Sixth, Trump already got one more or less decent Supreme Court Justice in. He might get another one in before he is impeached or his term ends. Hillary would have probably nominated the first Black or Latino genderfluid freak, a Chabad-Lubavitch rabbi or even Alan Dershowitz Himself (with a capital "H") to the Supreme Court and dared anybody to vote them down. Of course, compared to the risks of nuclear war, a Supreme Court Justice nominee might not appear to be crucial, but for those living inside the USA, such nominations can make a huge difference.

Seventh and last but not least, nuclear war is simply too horrible and threatens the future of the entire human race. I submit that we all, every one of us, has a moral duty to do everything we can to avoid it and to make it less likely, even if we can only act at the margins. This is one of those very rare cases where a single-issue vote really does make sense. I don't care how bad Trump turns out to be. In fact, even if he turns out to be even worse than Hillary, I submit that it is absolutely undeniable that on the day the Election took place Hillary was the candidate for war and Trump the candidate for peace. Those who claim otherwise seem to have forgotten that Hillary promised us a no-fly zone over Russian forces in Syria. They also forget this absolutely crucial statement made by Hillary Clinton in early December of 2012:

*"There is a move to re-Sovietize the region," (...)  
"It's not going to be called that. It's going to be called  
a customs union, it will be called the Eurasian Union  
and all of that," (...) "But let's make no mistake  
about it. We know what the goal is and we are trying  
to figure out effective ways to slow down or prevent  
it."*

There are also persistent rumors that Hillary was the one who told Bill to bomb Serbia. So this woman (sorry, I cannot call her a "lady") does have a record and that record is a frightening one. God only knows what would have happened if she had become the President. She clearly is a hateful maniac with a personal hate for Putin. There is absolutely no evidence indicating that Trump had that kind of hateful personality.

So while "Monday morning quarterbacking" is fun, it is also absurd. Those who now tell us "I told you so" are right but for the wrong reasons, whereas those who supported Trump were wrong, but for the right reasons. Trump betrayed his campaign promises, but those who voted for him could not simply assume that he



would do that; especially not when there was no reason at all to believe that Hillary would betray hers. Does anybody seriously believe that after being elected on a promise of war she would have turned into a dove of peace? Of course not.

Simply put: Hillary was guaranteed bad. Trump was possibly bad. The logical choice was therefore obvious, especially when 'bad' would most likely mean nuclear war.



# The Future of Islam in Western Europe

May 05, 2017

With the upcoming French Presidential election in France, the topic of Islam in Europe has again become central to the political discourse. This is nothing new: we also saw that in the UK, in Holland, in Austria and even in Switzerland, where the Muslim communities were banned – by popular referendum – from building minarets (even though only four minarets existed in Switzerland before that referendum)

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Swiss\\_minaret\\_referendum,\\_2009](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Swiss_minaret_referendum,_2009)). Tensions between Muslims and non-Muslims are clearly on the rise, not only due to some more or less racist or anti-immigrant feelings in the general population, but also due to the often appalling behavior of some refugees from Muslim countries (assaults, rapes, hooliganism) and even some Muslim communities in Europe (advocacy for terrorism, attempts to impose Sharia law). Before the situation gets better (assuming it ever will), it will most likely get worse, much worse.

So what are the options here?

First, let's agree with Otto von Bismarck's wise words that "*politics is the art of the possible*". Those Europeans who think that they will simply expel all Muslims from Europe or somehow manage to eliminate Islam from Europe are deluded. Likewise, those (rather few) Muslims who want to create some kind of Caliphate in Europe are no less deluded. In fact, all those who offer simple, straightforward "solutions" to the current crisis would be well advised to study some Hegelian dialectics to understand that the outcome of this crisis will not be the return to a *status quo ante* or the creation of an absolutely new reality.

Second, I submit that neither Muslim immigrants nor Islam itself will ever leave Europe. Like it or not, they are here to stay. Why? Simply because while some groups, such as illegal immigrants, can be expelled from a country or even from the European continent, others, such as Muslims holding European citizenships or local/native converts to Islam are simply not expellable. This is impossible legally, and this is impossible practically ... (expel where? how?). I have personally worked in refugee centers in Switzerland (as a translator and interpreter) and I have worked as an analyst for the Swiss General Staff where the issue of refugees was often front and center, and I can promise you that anybody who really knows how the system works also fully realizes that most of these immigrants are here to stay, even the pseudo-political refugees who are, in reality, economic immigrants and not political refugees at all (about 99% of so-called "political refugees"). At best, the EU could, in theory, and with an immense effort, close its borders to future immigrants. Not likely, but at least possible. But mass expulsions are simply not an option.

Third, those Muslims who are already in Europe will inevitably climb the social ladder even if right now they are at the bottom. Many of them are young, many of them have suffered hardships which most Europeans could never overcome. Their family, tribal, ethnic and religious ties are much stronger than the ones you can observe in the modern "nuclear" family of most Europeans.

Last, but not least, their social drive is much stronger than the one found in "established" Europeans circles. So even if the current generation is poorly educated and not integrated into the European society, the next one will be. I have seen that with many other economic migrants such as Italians or Albanians. So when you see that Iraqi woman sweeping the floors of your local hospital, remember that, in ten years or so, her daughter will likely work at

the same hospital, but as the medical doctor. In other words, the social power of the Muslim community will inevitably grow.

Does that mean that the EU will become ISIS-occupied territory where all women will end up wearing burkas and/or raped; all men forced to convert to Islam or murdered; that slave markets will spring up all over the country; that Sharia law will be imposed on everybody, and that homosexuals will be stoned to death?

Of course not! This is a silly caricature of Islam created and promoted by the AngloZionist 1%ers who run the Empire and who are trying to artificially create a clash of civilization which would allow them to remain in power and to continue pulling the strings from behind the scenes.

For one thing, Muslims will remain a rather small minority in Europe for the foreseeable future. But even more importantly, the kind of “Hollywood ISIS-Islam” which I portrayed in the paragraph above is not at all the kind of Islam most Muslims want to live in. In fact, many of them fled their own country precisely to avoid living in a Takfiri “Caliphate” (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Takfir>).

You might ask me about those Wahabi crazies who have already murdered many Europeans with screams of “Allahu Akbar” on their lips. Aren’t they bona fide ISIS-types? Well, that is a complicated issue. For example, did you notice the vast majority of these so-called “Islamic” crazies had strong ties to the European security services? That some of them even had traveled to Israel? Doesn’t it seem strange to you that their attacks somehow always seem to be scheduled to coincide with important political events in Europe? Could there have been a genuine ISIS attack in Europe? Yes. But I am pretty sure that most of them were Gladio-style false flags executed by EU or US special services.

I will readily agree that there are real and dangerous al-Qaeda/ISIS types in Europe right now. Yes, they do represent a real risk. But unlike most refugees, these guys do violate European laws and legal action can be taken against them. In theory, Europe could even re-introduce the death penalty for terrorism or even for apology of terrorism. I know, that ain't happening anytime soon; but what matters is that this will depend on a political decision - the political will of the Europeans. Not so for mass expulsions which are impossible regardless of any political decision or will.

Could there be an uprising or even a civil war in Europe? Yes, but only as long as the governments in power have a vested interest in letting one happen or creating one. As soon as the national authorities give the security forces and the military the green light to intervene and suppress the insurrection it's "game over" for the al-Qaeda types.

So while Islam per se or Muslims, in general, are not expellable from Europe, the European nations will be able to deal with the security situation provided there is a political will to do so.

Right now the European political class is split into two equally misguided political camps:

1. Those who think that any criticism of Muslims is "Islamophobic".
2. Those who think that all Muslims and Islam are bad, bad, bad, bad.

These are very primitive and fundamentally misguided positions. More importantly, both of these beliefs are bound to result in failure to achieve anything. For the time being, many Europeans and Americans appear to be stuck in this false choice, but no matter how long it takes, reality will eventually catch up with them and they will realize that there is no such thing as one

"Islam" or a single type of "Muslim". The truth is that the world of Islam is extremely diverse and that all of the ingredients needed for a complete defeat of Takfiris (whether of the al-Qaeda, ISIS, al-Nusra or any other kind) can be found inside Islam. In fact, they can only be found inside Islam. Let me illustrate my point by making a simple comparison between Russia and the EU.

Unlike the EU, Russia has one single central government and a strong one at that. The Russian intelligence and security services are amongst the best on the planet, as is the Russian military. Russia does not suffer from the disease of political correctness: it is totally acceptable in Russia to denounce Islamic terrorism in the harshest possible terms. In fact, Putin even made a famous statement about "offing the terrorists in the toilets if needed" and the Russians did exactly that: they killed every single Chechen Wahabi leader and, far from denying it, they proudly proclaimed it. The key difference with the EU is that Putin and the Russian people had the political will to stop the insurgency in Chechnia, even if that meant turning all of Chechnia into a pile of smoking rubble.

Yet, at the same time, Putin made major efforts to support the Muslim community in Russia. Not only did he build a huge (and beautiful) mosque in Moscow, he has embarked on a major program to support the growth of traditional Islam in Russia (just as he has done with the Orthodox Church). As for Chechnia, Putin has made Ramzan Kadyrov something of a "political son" and has given the Chechens an extremely wide autonomy, especially in matters of religion. So is Putin anti-Muslim or pro-Muslim? Neither. Putin understands a simple thing which, so far, totally eludes Western politicians: Russians are very good at killing Takfiris, but only Muslims can kill Takfirism.

The threat has never been Islam. The threat is Takfirism

(<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Takfir>). Here is how Wikipedia defines the concept of “Takfir”: *“In Islamic law, takfir or takfeer (Arabic: ريفكـت, takfir) refers to the practice of excommunication, one Muslim declaring another Muslim as Kafir (non-believer)”*. Please read this again carefully. The practice of declaring “another Muslim” as a non-believer. **Another Muslim!**

So the key characteristic of Takfiris is that they believe that all those who do not follow their version of Islam are not even Muslims. How do you think that this makes these other Muslims feel about the Takfiris? Actually, there is nothing wrong in theological terms with the notion of “Takfir” just as there is nothing wrong with the notion of “excommunication” or, for that matter, “anathema” or “heretic”. These are categories which, when properly used, are indispensable for specific types of theological arguments. However, just as “excommunicate”, “anathema” or “heretic” can be used by some as insults, slander or even calls to murder, “Takfirism” is first and foremost a mindset. Guns and bullets cannot defeat a mindset. In fact, only ideas can defeat other ideas. The Russians know that.

There are several videos on YouTube (alas, in Russian) which show Chechen leader Ramzan Kadyrov coming to the location of a battle with Chechen extremists and engaging the terrorists in a theological dispute about Islam. Instead of just ordering his troops to kill them all, he challenges them by asking them *“so you think that you are Muslims and we are not?”* or *“how is our society not Islamic?”*. And his favorite one *“if you can find a single quote in the Quran proving to me that what I do is not Islamic then I will immediately cease doing it”*. This does not always work. Some refuse to surrender and they are all inevitably killed (there is zero tolerance for Takfiris in Chechnia). But frequently this does work. Terrorists lay down their weapons, come out and instead of being abused and jailed or simply shot, they are sent to special prisons

where Islamic preachers come and spend long hours teaching them about true Islam. And more often than not, when these young men come out they become volunteers for the Chechen security forces!

Now I ask you – could an Orthodox Christian or an agnostic achieve the same result? Never, of course. So this is why the non-Muslim security forces, while still present in and around Chechnia, are always kept in a reserve and support role. The primary task to police Chechnia is fully entrusted to the Chechens themselves. There are always powerful Russian forces on high alert ready to intervene should the situation suddenly get out of control, but by now the real battle is not fought with guns, it is fought with ideas and, as Putin has said it many times, only real, traditional Islam, can defeat Takfirism.

Right now, most Western politicians simply don't get it. Or, if they do, they don't dare say it. But sooner or later the Europeans will have to come to that absolutely inevitable conclusion. And when that happens, they will finally realize that Islam and the Muslims who practice it are never the enemy. The enemy is a relatively small sect of Para-Islamic crazies which originated in the 13<sup>th</sup> century and which remained largely on the fringes of the Islamic world until it was given an immense boost first by the House of Saud and, later, by the US CIA. Today, the Takfiris are still the instrument of the AngloZionist Empire; they are the infection which is unleashed against any country daring to reject the Empire's dominion. Furthermore, the Takfiris are, first and foremost, a threat to any and all other variants of Islam, whether Shia or Sunni.

In conclusion – a beautiful image and a symbol.

Take a look at this photo:

<http://dxczjjuegupb.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/word-image.jpeg>



It shows the “Kremlin” (traditional Russian fortress) in the city of Kazan. Notice how the Orthodox churches and the mosque beautifully blend together?

Here is another photo of this beautiful sight:

<http://dxczjjuegupb.cloudfront.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/word-image-1.jpeg>

Is this not serene and peaceful?

Now please take a quick look at the history of Kazan as outlined in Wikipedia (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kazan>). Kazan was a city where Christians and Muslims viciously persecuted each other. Both sides practiced forced conversions and both sides engaged in full-scale massacres. In recent times, following the break-up of the Soviet Union, things almost got ugly again; there was a short-lived but very vocal local separatist movement. Then cool heads prevailed. But the fact is that the history of Kazan is hardly idyllic and that a lot of innocent blood has been shed there. The point here is that after centuries of warfare both Muslims and Orthodox Christians have learned how to coexist in peace and even create something truly beautiful, like this Kremlin, together. This would not have been possible with the Takfiris; the hateful and insane monsters who took pride in destroying the beautiful Syrian city of Palmyra. For them there is nothing beautiful in the photo above, it is a blasphemy. Should they ever seize power in Kazan, they would definitely destroy it all, including the mosque.

The lesson here is simple. First, former enemies do sometimes become friends and allies and, second; the church and mosque of the Kazan Kremlin protect each other and make this Kremlin far stronger than if only one of the two buildings was standing inside its walls.

Mosques are here to stay in Europe too, and the short-sighted who don't know history will view this as the end of their civilization and they are the ones who, without ever realizing it, will uselessly delay the eventual defeat of Takfirism in Europe and elsewhere. Those who do understand the real dynamics at play will see this as something very different; a chance at rebirth and a fantastic opportunity to truly crush Takfirism, both at home and abroad.

Right now Putin's Russia is the example of how "it is done". But the West is too busy demonizing everything "Putin" and supporting anything Russophobic, such as the Nazis in the Ukraine, that it simply cannot follow this example. But maybe a new generation of European politicians will.



## The Essential Saker: Book II, Section 2

### Russia and Islam, Part One: Introduction and Definitions

Today, I am beginning a series of articles on the very complex topic of Russia and Islam; a topic which is mostly overlooked in the West or, when it is mentioned at all, is often completely misunderstood. I have been researching this fascinating topic for many months already and there is so much to say about it that I have decided to write a series of installments, each one covering one specific aspect of this topic. The nature of the current relationship and interaction between Russia and Islam is a very complex one, with spiritual, political, social, economic, historical and geostrategic aspects. Without already jumping to my conclusions, I will say that the dialectical relationship between Russia and Islam is, I believe, currently undergoing some profound and very dynamic changes which make it impossible to confidently predict its future.

But first, it is important to stress here that Russia and Islam are not mutually opposite or mutually exclusive concepts. While relatively few ethnic Russians are Muslims, Russia has *always* been a multi-ethnic state, even when it was just a relatively small principality centered on the city of Kiev.

The word “Russian” in English is used to express two very different Russian concepts. The word “Russkii” means “Russian” as in “part of the Russian ethnicity or culture” and the word “Rossiiskii” means “part of the country of Russia”. Likewise, when Russians speak of “Russkie” they mean the Russian ethnicity whereas when they speak of “Rossiiskie” they refer to the nation-state; to a geographical area. Take for instance the current Minister

of Defense of Russia, Sergei Shoigu. He is an ethnic Tuvan through his father (and an ethnic Russian by his mother). If we ignore his maternal lineage, we could say that he is not an ethnic Russian ("Russkii") but he is a Russian national ("Rossiiskii"). By the way, Shoigu is not an Orthodox Christian, as are most ethnic Russians, but a Buddhist. Likewise, Russia's Minister of Internal Affairs between 2003 and 2011 was Rachid Nurgaliev, an ethnic Tatar, who was born as a Muslim but who eventually converted to the Orthodox faith. Again, he would be considered a "Rossiiskii" (Russian national) but not a "Russkii".

So while relatively few ethnic Russians are Muslims, there have always been many other (non-Russian) ethnic groups included in the Russian nation, including many Muslims, and these ethnic groups have often played a crucial role in Russian history. From the Vikings who founded the Kievan Rus', to the (mostly Muslim) Mongols who helped Saint Alexander Nevsky defeat the Teutonic Knights of the Papist Northern Crusaders, to the two Chechen special forces battalions who spearheaded the Russian counter-offensive against the Georgian Army in the 08.08.08 war – non-Russians have always played an important role in Russia's history and the existence of a fully legitimate historical "Russian Islam" cannot be denied. Put differently, if "Russkii Islam" is really a minor, almost private, phenomenon, "Rossiiskii Islam" is a phenomenon present throughout the 1000+ years of Russian history and an integral part of Russia's identity.

This is particularly important to keep in mind when one hears the misinformed opinions of those who would have Russia as a part of the so-called "Western Christendom". Let's make something clear, the most frequent and meaningful form of interaction the Russian nation has had with Western Christianity was war. And every single one of these wars was a defensive war against a Western aggression.

It is true that a good part of the Russian Imperial nobility, which was often of Germanic ethnic extraction and almost totally composed of active members of the Freemasonry, wanted Russia to become part of the Western civilization. However, this has always been a fashion only amongst wealthy elites, the already very westernized classes, what Marx would call the "superstructure" of Russia. The Russian Orthodox masses, however, were culturally far closer to their Muslim or Buddhist neighbors than to the westernized elites who took over the reins of power in the 18th century under Tsar Peter I.

While before the 18th century, nobody would seriously claim that Russia was part of the Western civilization. After the 18th century there has been an almost continuous effort by certain members of the Russian upper classes to "modernize" Russia, which really meant \*westernizing\* it. From Tsar Peter I to the Decembrist Freemasons

([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Decembrist\\_revolt](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Decembrist_revolt)), to the Kerensky regime, to the Yeltsin years, Russian "Westernizers" never gave up their struggle to turn Russia into a Western state. I would even claim that the entire Soviet experiment was also an attempt to westernize Russia, albeit not along the usual Papist or Masonic models, but along a Marxist one. What all these models have in common is a visceral dislike for the real Russian culture and spirituality, and an obsessive desire to "turn Russia into Poland". The perfect expression of this disdain/hatred for the Russian culture and nation can be found in the following words of Napoleon who said: "*Grattez le Russe, et vous trouverez le Tartare*" (scratch a Russian and you find a Tartar). Coming from the "Masonic Emperor" who used the sanctuaries of the Russian Orthodox Churches as stables for his horses and who, out of spite, attempted to blow-up the entire Kremlin; these words reveal the roots of his real aversion for the Russian people.

In contrast, 500 years before, the (mostly Muslim) Mongols who invaded Russia usually treated the Russian Church and the Orthodox clergy with the utmost respect. Sure, they did not hesitate to burn down a monastery and kill everybody inside, but only if the monastery was used by Russian insurgents in their struggle against the invaders. And yes, some Mongols did force Russian princes to walk through their pagan "purification fire", but these were not Muslims, but pagans. The undeniable fact is that when Russians were subjected to the Muslim yoke it was always far less cruel and barbaric than what the Papist, Masonic or Nazi invaders did every time they attempted to invade and subdue Russia. This is why there is no real anti-Islamic current in the Russian popular culture, at least not before the Soviet era which, unfortunately, fundamentally upset a delicate balance which had been reached before 1917.

In the past, westernizing forces saw themselves as "Europeans", as opposed to "Asians", and it is quite remarkable to see how these westernizing forces have become anti-Muslim nowadays (more about that later). While they wholeheartedly support the freedom to organize so-called "Gay pride" parades or the actions of the "Pussy Riot" group, these westernizing forces are categorically opposed to the right of young Muslim girls to wear a scarf on their heads while in school.

Frankly, I do not want to spend any more time discussing the pro-Western forces in Russia mainly because they really have been weakened to the point of representing less than 1 or 2 percent of the population by now. I have to mention these forces here, mostly as a leftover from almost 300 years of unsuccessful attempts to westernize Russia, but this is not where the "interesting stuff" is happening nowadays.

Nowadays, it is the heated debates about Islam inside and amongst the various anti-Western or "patriotic" groups which are so interesting, and this will be the topic of a future installment. But next, we will need to look at the current spiritual condition of the majority of the Russian people.



## Russia and Islam, Part Two: Russian Orthodoxy

Most people assume that Russia is a Christian Orthodox country and that the Russian Orthodox Church is the spiritual leader of the Russian people. This is a very superficial view and, I would even say, a fundamentally mistaken one. To explain what I mean by this, I will have to explain something absolutely crucial and yet something most fundamentally misunderstood by the vast majority of people, including many Russians. **The Russian Orthodox Church as an institution and the Orthodox spirituality of the Russian people has been severely persecuted for at least 300+ years.** So crucial is this phenomenon that I will need to make a short historical digression into the history of Russia.

From the moment Russia was baptized into Christianity by Saint Vladimir in 988 to the 17th-century rule of Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, the Orthodox Church was the organic core of the Russian civilization. In the words of Alexander Solzhenitsyn (<http://www.roca.org/OA/36/36h.htm>):

*“In its past, Russia did know a time when the social ideal was not fame, or riches, or material success, but a pious way of life. Russia was then steeped in an Orthodox Christianity which remained true to the Church of the first centuries. The Orthodoxy of that time knew how to safeguard its people under the yoke of a foreign occupation that lasted more than two centuries, while at the same time fending off iniquitous blows from the swords of Western crusaders. During those centuries the Orthodox faith in our country became part of the*



*very pattern of thought and the personality of our people, the forms of daily life, the work calendar, the priorities in every undertaking, the organization of the week and of the year. Faith was the shaping and unifying force of the nation.”*

The 17th century, however, saw an abrupt and violent change to this state of affairs. Again, in the words of Solzhenitsyn:

*“But in the 17th century, Russian Orthodoxy was gravely weakened by an internal schism. In the 18th, the country was shaken by Peter's forcibly imposed transformations, which favored the economy, the state, and the military at the expense of the religious spirit and national life. And along with this lopsided Petrine enlightenment, Russia felt the first whiff of secularism; its subtle poisons permeated the educated classes in the course of the 19th century and opened the path to Marxism. By the time of the Revolution, faith had virtually disappeared in Russian educated circles; and amongst the uneducated, its health was threatened.”*

By the time Tsar Nicholas II inherited the throne in 1896 the Russian society was suffering from a deep spiritual crisis: most of the ruling class was highly secularized if not completely materialistic. Almost every single aristocratic family had joined the Freemasonry, while the rest of the country, still mostly composed of peasants, was nominally Christian Orthodox, but not in the deep way the Russian nation had been before the 17th century.

Russian Tsars often ended up being real persecutors of the Russian Orthodox Church; in particular, those upon whom the Russian aristocracy and the West bestowed the title of "Great". Peter I, the so-called "Great" decapitated the Russian Orthodox

Church by abolishing the title of Patriarch from the head of the Church and replacing him by "Synod" run by a laymen bureaucrat with the rank of "Chief Procurator" who did not even have to be Orthodox himself. *De facto* and *de-jure* in 1700 the Russian Orthodox Church became a state institution, like a ministry. Under Catherine I, also called the "Great", monastics were persecuted with such viciousness that it was actually illegal for them to possess even a single sheet of paper in their monastic cell, lest they write something against the regime.

Other Tsars (such as Alexander II, or Alexander III) were far more respectful of the Church and Tsar Nicholas II, who was a deeply religious and pious man, even restored the autonomy of the Church by allowing it to elect a new Patriarch.

And yet, by and large, the Russian Orthodox Church underwent a process of quasi-continuous weakening under the combined effects of overt persecutions and more subtle secularization from the 17th to the 20th century.

In the 20th century during the reign of Tsar Nicholas II, Russian Orthodoxy saw a short but amazing rebirth immediately followed by a mass persecution under the Bolshevik rule whose viciousness and scale was previously unheard of in the history of the Church. Again, in the words of Solzhenitsyn:

*"The world had never before known godlessness as organized, militarized, and tenaciously malevolent as that practiced by Marxism. Within the philosophical system of Marx and Lenin, and at the heart of their psychology, hatred of God is the principal driving force, more fundamental than all their political and economic pretensions. Militant atheism is not merely incidental or marginal to Communist policy; it is not a side effect, but the central pivot. The 1920's in the USSR witnessed an uninterrupted procession of victims and martyrs amongst*

*the Orthodox clergy. Two metropolitans were shot, one of whom, Veniamin of Petrograd*

*([http://orthodoxwiki.org/Benjamin\\_Kazansky\\_of\\_Petrograd](http://orthodoxwiki.org/Benjamin_Kazansky_of_Petrograd)), had been elected by the popular vote of his diocese.*

*Patriarch Tikhon*

*([http://orthodoxwiki.org/Tikhon\\_of\\_Moscow](http://orthodoxwiki.org/Tikhon_of_Moscow)) himself passed through the hands of the Cheka-GPU and then died under suspicious circumstances. Scores of archbishops and bishops perished. Tens of thousands of priests, monks, and nuns, pressured by the Chekists to renounce the Word of God, were tortured, shot in cellars, sent to camps, exiled to the desolate tundra of the far North, or turned out into the streets in their old age without food or shelter. All these Christian martyrs went unswervingly to their deaths for the faith; instances of apostasy were few and far between. For tens of millions of laymen access to the Church was blocked, and they were forbidden to bring up their children in the Faith: religious parents were wrenched from their children and thrown into prison, while the children were turned from the faith by threats and lies...”*

This is a complex and tragic history which I cannot discuss in any detail here so I will insist on only one important consequence of these events: the Russian Orthodox Church eventually split into at least 4 distinct groups:

a) The “official” or “state” Orthodox Church, which eventually became the Moscow Patriarchate. Largely composed of modernist clergymen, this “official” Soviet Church not only denied the reality of the persecution of Christians in Russia, it often *actively collaborated with these persecutions* (by denouncing “subversive” clergymen, for example).

b) The “Josephites” composed of the followers of Metropolitan Joseph of Petrograd ([http://orthodoxwiki.org/Joseph\\_Petrovykh\\_of\\_Petrograd](http://orthodoxwiki.org/Joseph_Petrovykh_of_Petrograd)). They openly refused to submit the Church to the Bolshevik regime and were eventually martyred for their stance. Some joined the following group.

c) The "Catacomb Church". This was an illegal underground organization, led by secret bishops, which rejected the right of the Bolsheviks to take over the Church and which went into deep hiding, practically disappearing from public view.

d) The “Russian Orthodox Church Abroad”. Composed of exiles, this was an organization created by Metropolitan Anthony of Kiev ([http://orthodoxwiki.org/Anthony\\_Khrapovitsky\\_of\\_Kiev](http://orthodoxwiki.org/Anthony_Khrapovitsky_of_Kiev)) who, with the blessing of Patriarch Tikhon, united around itself most of the Orthodox Russians who had fled the Soviet Union.

It is important to stress here that even though the Josephites, the Catacomb Church, and the Church Abroad had very few practical means to communicate with each other, they were all in communion with each other and recognized each other as legitimate branches of the One Russian Orthodox Church, although each one in unique and specific circumstances. Not so with the first entity, the official "Soviet" Church which was denounced by all three groups as at the very least illegal and possibly even as the Satanic tool of the Bolsheviks.

Why is all this so important?

Because the current official “Russian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate” is a direct descendant of this first group which was unanimously rejected by literally tens of thousands of saints who were martyred for their faith by the Bolshevik regime. In patristic theological terms, the Moscow Patriarchate and its members are “**lapsed**“, i.e., those who did not have the courage to resist the persecutors of the Church and who therefore

severed their communion to the Church. The fact that they created an ecclesiastical entity in conditions prohibited by canon law makes them “**schismatics**“. The fact that they developed a specific teaching (“Sergianism“ (<http://www.roac-suzdal.narod.ru/sergianism.htm>): based on the idea that the Church can be “saved” by way of compromise with evil) to justify such actions makes them “**heretics**” (please note that in a theological discourse terms like “heretic” are not insults, but simply indicators of a specific spiritual condition/status).

The above is an *extremely superficial and even simplistic mini-overview* of a long and extremely complex topic and I ask for the understanding of those who know about this and who might be appalled at how much I have not discussed here. I am aware of that, but this is simply not the time and place to write a halfway decent history of Russian Orthodoxy in the 20th century. The only other historical detail I will add here is that during WWII, Stalin very substantially eased some of the worst persecutions against the Church and that these persecutions did, in part, resume under Khrushchev. Again, I apologize for the extreme “shorthand” of the outline above, and I ask that you take only the following two important concepts with you:

1. Russian Orthodoxy has been continuously weakened for the past 300+ years
2. The organization currently officially representing Russian Orthodoxy has major legitimacy issues and is often viewed with deep suspicion, even by very religious people.

I now need to say a few words about the modern “Moscow Patriarchate” as it is today, over two decades since the end of any anti-religious persecutions.

First, it is by far the most “Soviet” institution of the Russian polity. Or, to put it in other words, it is by far the *least* reformed “leftover” of the Soviet era. To make things worse, it is also

currently run by a notoriously corrupt individual, “Patriarch” Kirill; a sly and utterly dishonest individual, known for his shady business dealings and for his rabid adherence to the so-called “Ecumenical Movement” (a heresy from the Orthodox point of view)

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ecumenism#Ecumenical\\_movement](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ecumenism#Ecumenical_movement).

To top it all off, there is some pretty good evidence that Kirill I might be a secret Papist Cardinal, something called a “cardinale in pectore” ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/In\\_pectore](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/In_pectore)) which, if true, is probably used against him by the Russian security services to make sure that he does whatever the Kremlin says.

For all its faults, the Moscow Patriarchate fulfills an extremely important role for the Russian state: that of ideological substitute for the now officially abandoned Marxist ideology.

One can often hear the statement that about 70% of Russians are Orthodox Christians. This is wrong and highly misleading. According to data published in Wikipedia ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Religion\\_in\\_Russia](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Religion_in_Russia)), about 40% of Russians are Orthodox Christians. Better. But what does that really mean? Mostly that these Russians identify with the Russian Orthodox traditions, that they try to live by Christian ethics and that they refer to themselves as “Orthodox”. But if we take the figures published annually by the Moscow city authorities on the attendance of the single most important religious service in the Orthodox tradition – Easter (called “Paskha” in Russian) we see that only about 1% of Moscovites actually attended it. What about the remaining 39%?!

It is impossible to come by one “true” figure, but *I would estimate that no more than 5% of the Russian population could be considered as “deeply/consciously, religious”*. And yet, the Moscow Patriarchate plays a crucial role in the Kremlin’s power structure. Not only does it provide a substitute for the now defunct Marxist

ideology, it serves as a “patriotic education” organization; it offers a series of well-recognized symbols (beautiful churches, religious singing, icons, crosses, etc.) which can all be used as national symbols (rather than spiritual symbols). Those national symbols are recognized, if not necessarily fully endorsed, by far more than the 40+ percent of Russians which are nominally Orthodox. To paraphrase the American expression “to rally around the flag”, Russians are nowadays encouraged to “rally around the cross” even if on a deep internal level they don’t really understand, or care, what the symbol of the Cross really means in Orthodox Christianity.

Let me give you an example of what all this ends up looking like. Read the transcript of the speech which Vladimir Putin made at the Council of Bishops of the Moscow Patriarchate (<http://eng.kremlin.ru/transcripts/4926>).

It is all about patriotism, patriotism and more patriotism. Not a single word in all this is devoted to spiritual topics. Not one. This speech could have been made to an assembly of officials of an ideological department of the CPSU.

For the Moscow Patriarchate, this tight collaboration with the Kremlin also has an immense advantage: it grants it a legitimacy which history so unambiguously denies it. While there are still remnants of the Catacomb Church in Russia, and while outside Russia there still is an Orthodox Church Abroad

(<http://sinod.ruschurchabroad.org/engindex.htm>),

these organizations are tiny compared to the huge Moscow Patriarchate, with its 100+ bishops, 26,000+ parishes, and 100,000,000+ official members. And when any of these small groups succeeds in gathering the funds to open a small parish somewhere in Russia, the Moscow Patriarchate can always count on the local riot police to expel them and "return" the building to the Moscow Patriarchate.

I apologize once again for the extreme degree of oversimplification I had to settle for to write this (already too long!) overview. What I have done is mention what I believe are essential background factors which must be kept in mind when looking into the topic of Russia and Islam.

In particular, it has to be clearly understood that *the official Orthodox Church, the Moscow Patriarchate, is not an important factor at all in the dialectical relationship between the Russian society and Islam*, if only because inside the Russian society the status of the Orthodox faith is an extremely weakened one. In other words, the topic of “Russia and Islam” should not be confused with the topic “Orthodox Christianity and Islam”. In many ways, ***modern Russia is neo-Orthodox, para-Orthodox or even post-Orthodox but most definitely not truly Orthodox.***

This, however, begs the obvious question: if the dominant ethos of the Russian society is not Marxist anymore, and if it is not really Orthodox Christian either than what is it? Other than being predominantly *anti-Western* or *anti-capitalist*, what does the Russian society today stand *for* (as opposed to against) and how does Russian society react to the values offered by Islam. This will be the topic of the next installment of this series.





## Russia and Islam, Part Three: Internal Russian Politics

In the first two installments of this series on Russia and Islam, we have seen that the reasons why neither the modern European civilizational model nor the traditional Orthodox faith can, at this point in time, provide a viable and positive source of ideological or spiritual inspiration for post-Soviet Russia. While in the past three hundred years the ideologically dominant philosophical and political paradigm has been the "Westernizing" one, the absolute disasters which inevitably resulted from any "liberals" coming to power in Russia (Kerensky, Yeltsin), combined with the West's betrayal of all its promises made to Gorbachev (NATO would not move East) has finally resulted in a collapse of this model. The vast majority of Russians today would agree on the following basic ideas:

a) The West is no friend to Russia, never was, never will be, and the only way to deal with it is from a position of strength.

b) Russia needs a strong government led by a strong leader.

c) Russian "liberals" (in the modern Russian use of the word) are a small degenerate group of US-worshipping intellectuals who hate Russia.

d) Russia has to be a "social state" and the "pure" capitalist model is both morally wrong and fundamentally unsustainable, as shown by the current financial crisis.

e) The democratic system is a fraud used by the rich for their own interests.

So far so good, but what is the alternative?

Historically, there used to be a traditionalist model which said that Russia needed to be a Christian Orthodox country; where the highest secular power needed to be vested in a Tsar whose power

must be kept in check by a powerful and autonomous Church, and where the people's will would be expressed in a Zemskii Sobor, a "Council of the Land" - something like a Parliament with a primarily consultative function. This idea was expressed by philosophers and writers such as Khomiakov, Tikhomirov, Rozanov, Solonevich, Iliin, Solzhenitsyn, Ogurtsov and many others.

With many caveats and disclaimers, I would say that this would be the Russian Orthodox version of the type of regime we see today in the Islamic Republic of Iran. Not a theocracy, of course, but a regime in which the fundamental structure, nature, function, and goal of the state is to uphold spiritual values. A regime with a strong democratic component, but who's popular will can, when needed, be vetoed by the highest spiritual authorities. I would call such a system a "directed democracy", in which the tactical decisions are left to the will of the majority of the people, but whose strategic direction is set and cannot be replaced by another one.

The big difference between Russia and Iran is that in Iran the Islamic model is clearly fully endorsed by a strong majority of the population. In contrast, in Russia even most nominally Orthodox Christians would have great reservations about attempting to establish such an "Orthodox Republic". It's hard to come by any credible figure, but my personal gut feeling is that no more than 10% of Russians would feel comfortable with such a proposition. In other words, the idea of the establishment of an "Orthodox Republic" would probably be opposed by 90% of the people.

I personally deplore this state of affairs, if only because this is the model which I believe would be best for Russia, but politics being the science of the possible, it makes no sense to stubbornly latch on to an impossibility.

Then what? What are the other options?

The currently “visible” choice of political parties is both reflective of the main currents in society and, at the same time, rather misleading. Let’s look at what these parties are:

1) “United Russia”. Putin’s party. I would describe it as moderately patriotic (but not nationalistic) party, definitely committed to a strong Russia, “social” in economic terms, “independent” in international relations.

2) The “Liberal Democratic Party of Russia”. Led by Vladimir Zhirinovski, it is vehemently anti-Communist and anti-Soviet; nationalistic in a buffoon-like manner; also “social” in economic terms; plain crazy in international relations.

3) The Communist Party of Russia. Led by Gennadii Ziuganov, this is a pathetically reactionary party which openly claims to be the successor of the former CPSU. It is led by a “boar” like politician who could be sitting right next to Brezhnev or Chernenko. It has no real vision, except for nostalgia for the USSR.

4) “Just Russia”. Led by Sergei Mironov, a former paratrooper turned Social-Democrat, it is a moderately “left center” version of “United Russia”. It’s a ‘nice’ party which will never make any real difference.

5) All the pro-US parties which could not even make it into the Duma, and whose protests and demonstrations rapidly fizzled out. They are fundamentally irrelevant.

What does all this mean in reality?

There is only one party in Russia – the “United Russia” party of Putin and Medvedev. Both the Liberal Democrats and the Communists are just there to provide a safety valve function for the unhappy. While these parties do absorb a big chunk of the people who oppose Putin and United Russia, in the Duma, these parties always end up voting with the Kremlin. This is also pretty much true for “Just Russia” which is so small anyway, that it does not

really matter. The other useful function of the Liberal Democrats and the Communists is that it keeps the “crazies” away from the Kremlin. The hysterical nationalists and the nostalgic Communists are absorbed by these two parties and that makes them instantly irrelevant.

I feel that it is important to stress here that there are smart, well-educated and articulate nationalists and communists who do NOT belong to the Liberal Democratic or Communist parties. I am thinking of nationalists like Dmitri Rogozin (who is currently the Deputy Premier of Russian Government in charge of the defense and space industry) or Stalinists such as Nikolai Starikov (the head of the Union of Citizens of Russia). Frankly, smart people stay away from these two parties.

The reality is that there is only one game in town: United Russia and its non-party “All-Russia People’s Front”, created by Putin as a political movement for new ideas. Everything else is pretty much a way of making the system look “democratic” and legitimate.

Let’s sum it all up.

Russia is a multi-ethnic country which currently lacks any kind of unifying ideology or spirituality, led by a single group of people whose ideology can be summed up by a mix of pragmatism, patriotism, modern socialism, and multilateralism in international relations. Most importantly, **Modern Russia is neither the Imperial Russia of pre-1917 nor is it the Soviet Union and it would be fundamentally wrong to seek parallels in the past to understand the current nature of the relationship between Russia and Islam.**

This is a big temptation, into which the vast majority of western observers always fall: to seek parallels between current events and past events. While it is true that an understanding of the past is often the key to the understanding of the present, in the

case of Russia and Islam this is not an appropriate approach. For example, to compare the wars in Chechnia under Yeltsin and then Putin, to the way Stalin dealt with Chechens or to the way Russia invaded the Caucasus under Alexander I can only fundamentally mislead, bring to wholly inapplicable parallels, and result in deeply mistaken conclusions.

**Modern Russia does not have a clear definition of itself. Lacking that type of definition, it is unable to articulate some kind of consensual view on what Islam means for Russia.**

Some Russians see in Islam a very dangerous enemy; others see Islam as a natural ally. This is all made even more complicated by the fact that Islam itself is hardly a unified phenomenon and that each time we think of Islam we need to be specific on what *type* and even what *aspect* of Islam we are talking about.

For Russia, Islam represents a mix of risks and opportunities in many aspects, including spiritual, political, social, economic, historical and geostrategic aspects. To be fully understood, the topic of "Russia and Islam" needs to be looked at in each and every one of these aspects and what we will see is that there are different "currents" inside Russia who very much disagree with each other on whether Islam is a risk or an opportunity in every single one of these aspects. So rather than to speak of "risks and opportunities", I will refer to the spiritual, political, social, economic, historical and geostrategic "challenges" which Islam represents for Russia. This will be the topic of the next installment.



## Russia and Islam, Part Four: “Islam” as a Threat

The first thing to which I would like to draw your attention is that in the title *Russia and Islam, part four: “Islam” as a threat* I put the word “Islam” in quotation marks. This is very important, as most of the issues I will be discussing today are not directly linked to Islam at all. However, *in the minds of many Russians*, these issues **are** linked to Islam and it is therefore simply impossible to analyze the topic of “Russia and Islam” without taking a long hard look at the connection which a lot of Russians make between some issues (with no direct relationship to Islam) and Islam itself.

The use of words can be very tricky in this context. Take the word “Muslim”. What does it really mean? In Bosnia, the word “Muslim” was really used to describe a “non-Orthodox and non-Catholic Bosnian” since both Croats and Serbs often were natives of Bosnia and since Bosnian-Croats, Bosnian-Serbs and Bosnian-Muslims are all of the exact same ethnic stock (hence the fallacy of speaking of “ethnic cleansing” in the Bosnian context). Later, the rather inept term “Bosniac” was coined, as opposed to “Bosnian” because to use “Muslim” or “Bosnian” just made no sense. Regardless, by fiat of some politicians, what used to be called “Muslim” became “Bosniac” overnight.

Likewise, in Ireland, the “troubles” were supposed to be between Catholics and Protestants, but did the IRA or the Ulster Volunteers really care about the Papacy or Martin Luther? Did these denominations really play a relevant role in this conflict?

This is hardly a new issue. In the past, both the Russian Empire and the Ottoman Empire *assimilated religious groups into ethnic minorities*, hence the Karaites in Russia were not considered as Jews while the Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople was

referred to by the Ottomans as “*Millet-Bashi*” or “ethnarch”. In modern France, there is a “problem” of the Muslim immigration and its effects on the suburbs of many French cities. But taking a closer look at these (mostly Algerian) immigrants one could legitimately wonder to what degree this is an “Islamic” problem. This confusion between “Islam” (as a faith, a religion) and “Muslim” (used as *both* a sign of religious *and*, often, ethnic affiliation) is as frequent in modern Russia as it is in France. Keeping all these caveats in mind, let’s look at the type of issues which makes many Russians see “Islam” (in quotation marks) as a threat.

**a) Immigration and crime.**

Ever since the dissolution of the former Soviet Union, there has been a steady flow of immigrants from some former Soviet republics (Azerbaijan, Tajikistan, etc.) towards big Russian cities. In parallel, a large number of immigrants from the Caucasus (Chechens, Dagestani, etc.) also immigrated to central parts of Russia. The combination of these in migratory flow resulted in a vast increase of immigrants in every major Russian city. As is so often the case, while some of these immigrants came looking for a job, there were enough criminal elements amongst them to strongly tie the issue of immigration and crime to each other. Typically, these immigrants from the south were composed of a mix of four groups:

1. Law-abiding and hardworking workers; often ruthlessly exploited and treated as quasi-slaves by their local employers.
2. Arrogant and very poorly educated young men who, while not necessarily criminals, act in highly provocative and offensive manners.

3. Petty thugs who combine an official job with petty criminal activities.
4. Hardened criminals who are deeply involved in drugs, prostitution, illegal casinos, etc.

Typically, the first group is bigger than the second which, in turn, is bigger than the third, while the fourth group is the smallest of all. And yet, that explosive combination achieves in Russia exactly the same effect as it does in France: it associates crime and immigration in the mind of many, if not most, people.

Furthermore, since most of these immigrants come from historically Muslim countries, and since many of them consider themselves Muslims, many Russians experience their first or most frequent interaction with putative “Muslims” in a criminal situation. As for the fact that in the vast majority of these cases, these “Muslim thugs” know absolutely nothing about Islam is not at all apparent, in particular, from a Russian point of view.

The French author and philosopher Alain Soral, who is very actively engaged in efforts to reconcile and unite all French citizens against the NWO, including Christians and Muslims, speaks of “*Islamo-racaille*” (“Islamo-scum”): young loud thugs, wearing “rapper-gangsta” gear, with NYC baseball hats and who speak of Allah and Kufars while driving around in sports cars – often high or drunk – looking for somebody to rob, rape or abuse. As Soral points out – these people are not exactly the type you would see coming out of a mosque, and the very same is true in Russia. Still, it is undeniable that many Russians still make the association “Islam” <-> crime.

#### **b) Wahabism – internal**

The wars in Chechnia and the Islamic terrorism in Dagestan and many other parts of Russia have had a huge impact on the Russian public opinion. The two in Chechnia, in particular,



resulted in a deep aversion of the Chechen insurgents and any other Islamic terrorist group which could be described as “Wahabi”. Initially, the combined propaganda tsunami of the Western corporate media and the Russian “liberal” media left people confused as to what was really going on, but soon the horrible events on the ground became impossible to suppress: the Chechen insurgents combined the very worst of the Wahabi extremism with the worst of Chechen thuggery. Thousands of people were summarily executed, women raped, Russian soldiers and even civilians were tortured to death, crucified, skinned alive, raped and beheaded. Hostages were kidnapped from all over southern Russia and a slave market was working each day in downtown Grozny. And all these horrors were committed by bearded men, brandishing green and black flags embroidered with *suras* of the Kuran, and to the constant screams of *Allahu Akbar*. And since the Chechen insurgents loved to use their cellphones to videotape their atrocities, a steady stream of blood-curdling videos made it to Russian TV and Internet sites. By 2000 the Russian public opinion was ripe to give no quarter to any Islamic terrorist or anybody supporting them.

To make things worse, the Chechen insurgency had the support of the vast majority of the Muslim world which, just as in Bosnia or Kosovo, automatically sided with the “Muslim” party no matter what (I call this the “My *Umma* – right or wrong” position). That knee-jerk support for the Muslim side, even if it is largely composed of Wahabi terrorists and criminals, put a big stain on the image of Islam in Russia and gave a lot of weight to the “conflict of civilizations” paradigm which the West and its supporters in Russia wanted to impose upon the Russian public opinion.

If, under Yeltsin, the Russian state proved completely incapable of taking any kind of measures to deal with this situation,

under Putin things changed extremely rapidly as shown by the 2nd Chechen war which basically crushed the insurgency. Subsequently, the combined efforts of a completely revamped Russian security establishment and the coming to power of Akhmad and, later, Ramazan Kadyrov completely changed the situation. Grozny was rebuilt in record time, and Chechnia became one of the safest republics of the entire Caucasus (at the expense of Dagestan where the situation got worse). The cost in human lives and suffering was absolutely horrendous, both for Russians (almost all those who survived left Chechnia) and for Chechens who died in huge numbers. The main scar left by this war though is that Russia has become a society with zero tolerance for any form of Wahabism and the Russian people have fully endorsed what I call the “Putin doctrine” of dealing with Wahabis: “change your ways or expect to be annihilated”. This, by the way, applies to both individuals and ethnic groups: against a Wahabi enemy, the Russian people will support the harshest possible military methods of warfare, something of which a lot of Muslim communities are acutely aware (more about that later).

In Chechnia itself, Ramzan Kadyrov instituted an even harsher anti-Wahabi policy than in the rest of Russia. During the 2nd Chechen war, foreign mercenaries and preachers were interrogated and then summarily executed by both Russian and Chechen forces and ever since, Saudi, Yemeni or Pakistani preachers are simply barred from entering Chechnia.

Contrary to the predictions of most “experts”, the Kremlin did successfully deal with the situation in Chechnia, but one inevitable side effect of this success was that a lot of the Wahabi extremists were flushed out of Chechnia into neighboring Dagestan and even the rest of Russia. And that second problem is far from solved. While the USA and the UK have now toned down their

pro-Chechen rhetoric, the Saudis are still pushing Wahabi-Islam into Russia, although in a more discrete manner.

First, they train preachers in Saudi Arabia and send them back to Russia. Then these preachers form small communities, often inside mosques, where the faithful are recruited for social and religious activities. During that phase, the candidates for the next step are carefully investigated, vetted and selected for the next phase: the establishment of weapons caches, safe houses, training grounds, and the like. Eventually, the new recruits are used to attack police stations, banks, murder traditional (anti-Wahabi) clergymen, and opposing Mafia gangs. Russian security services have observed that sequence in Dagestan, Kazan, and Stavropol (regions with large Muslim minorities), but also in Saint Petersburg, a city with a very small and very traditionalist Muslim population. So far, the security services have managed to stay one step ahead, but this is far from over and that kind of penetration efforts can last a very long time.

One of the crucial aspects of this dynamic is the reaction of the local, traditional, Muslim spiritual leaders.

First, as I have mentioned above, no Russian Muslims want to have a "2nd Chechen war" happen in their own town or region, because they have no doubts whatsoever about the outcome of such a situation.

Second, traditional Muslim spiritual leaders are themselves the first victims of the Wahabi infiltrators who often begin their "active" phase of operations by murdering the local imams.

Third, Muslims in Russia are often very rapidly disillusioned with the Saudi version of Islam which declares as "un-Islamic" many customs and traditions which are at the core of the cultural identity of many Muslim groups in Russia.

Fourth, for all the thugs from the Caucasus behaving in obnoxious and vulgar manners in Central Russia, the fact is that

the Muslim communities these young people come from are often very conservative and peaceful and that the older generation deeply disapproves of the kind of behavior which, in their opinion, brings shame upon their people.

Fifth, one should not under-estimate the legacy of the Soviet period which promoted both secularism and modernism and which has left a strong mark on the local elites. These elites are both outraged and horrified when they are told by Wahabi preachers that they have to completely abandon their way of life and begin living according to medieval precepts.

Finally, there is an inherent tension between any form of nationalism and the Saudi style Wahabism being imported to Russia. This tension is one of the key elements which turned the Kadyrov clan against the various Wahabi warlords in Chechnia which were viewed by the more nationalist Chechen leaders as arrogant foreigners who were enemies of the Chechen ancestral traditions.

For all these reasons, there is a lot of push-back on the part of the local Muslim communities and Muslim leaders against the type of Wahabi style Islam the Saudis have been trying to export to Russia.

### **c) Wahabism – external**

Wahabism is not only an internal threat for Russia, it is also a major external threat. According to Russian analysts, the Obama Administration has brought with itself a fundamentally new set of imperialist policies which are now being implemented. During the Bush era, the USA exercised direct control, mostly by means of military interventions, over the Middle-East and Africa. This “direct” approach is the way the Jewish Lobby and the Neocons believed that the USA should maintain its global empire. Obama represents a very different type of constituency (old “Anglo” money) which is vehemently opposed to the Neocons and which

will agree to pay lip service to the Israeli-firsters but, in reality, places US strategic interests far ahead of any Zionist priorities. In practical terms, this means that the Obama administration will withdraw as many US troops as possible and relinquish the direct control over contested regions and that it will secure its domination over a country or region by means of chaos. **This is a policy of indirect imperial control.**

After all, why invade and occupy a country, thereby losing US blood and money, when one can use proxies to create a situation of absolute chaos inside that country? In the best of cases, chaos leads to a Libyan-style "regime change" and in the worst case, a civil war like the one taking place in Syria. But in either case, undesirable heads of state like Gaddafi or Assad have been "de-fanged" and their countries removed from any possible anti-US alliance. As for the "good guys" of the day (say Abdullah in Jordan or Hamad in Bahrain), they are protected from the surrounding chaos at rather limited costs.

According to Russian analysts, the **Wahabi and "al-Qaeda" types are the foot soldiers of this new US imperial policy.** The US simply "injects" them in any society it wants to subvert and then it sits on the sidelines without much else to do than to send in Special Forces to assist here and there, depending on the needs of the moment. In this situation, the CIA agent is the puppeteer and the Wahabi crazy the puppet, whether it is aware of that or not.

The big fear of Russian analysts is that this US strategy will be used to remove Assad and then that it will be used against Iran. True, Syria has a large Sunni population, whereas Iran is predominantly Shia, whom the Wahabis hate with a special seething loathing. Still, Iran does have small Kurdish, Turkmen and Balochi (Sunni) minorities which, combined with pro-Western "Gucci revolutionaries" of the upper classes, can pose a real risk to the regime. And, if not, there is always the option of triggering a

war between Iran and some Sunni country. Most Russian analysts believe that Iran is strong enough to resist such attempts to destabilize, but they remain very attentive to the situation because they agree that if Iran was to be engulfed into some form of US-sponsored chaos, this would directly affect the southern regions of Russia.

Some analysts also see this US “indirect” or “control through chaos” strategy as a “win-win” for the USA even if their Wahabi proxies are defeated. They ask a simple question: what will happen if Assad convincingly wins the war in Syria? **Where will the Wahabis go next?** Back to Mali, which they temporarily left to avoid engaging the French? Or into Algeria, to start a civil war there? Or maybe into Kosovo or even southern France? And what if these Wahabis decided to “test the waters” in Kazakhstan?

These types of concerns bring some Russian security specialists to actually see a positive aspect to the war in Syria. Simply put – Assad is killing a lot of al-Qaeda types and every Wahabi crazy killed in Syria is one less candidate for a transfer to another holy war in another part of the world.

We now can clearly distinguish the rationale behind the Russian policy not to threaten to shut down NATO supply lines over Russia, regardless of the amount of obnoxious and hostile pronouncements and actions from the US side: the Russians want the Americans to remain in Afghanistan as long as possible to give time for Russia and its allies like Tajikistan to prepare for a Taliban regime to return to power in Kabul. In the meantime, Russia is strengthening its powerful 201 Russian Military Base (ex- 201 Motor-Rifle Division) in Tadjikistan and providing technical assistance to the Tajik Border Guards.

**As part of the recent reforms of the Russian Armed Forces, the entire Russian military has been reorganized into four Strategic Commands,** each capable of independently waging a

regional defensive war independently by directly controlling practically all the military forces and resources in its area. It is interesting to note that while the Southern Strategic Command is the smallest one in size, it is by far the most combat ready. If there is anything which the 08.08.08 war with Georgia has convincingly shown, it is the lightning speed with which the 58th Army and the Black Sea Fleet were ready to go to war (even though it took the Kremlin quite some time to finally react). It is quite clear that following the Russian successes in Chechnia and Georgia, Moscow is most definitely not letting its guard down and that it will remain ready to engage in a wide spectrum of military operations ranging from local clashes to a full-scale regional war.

**d) Islam through the prism of the "clash of civilizations".**

This aspect of the "Islamic threat" is fundamentally different from all the other ones as it is predicated on a thesis which has never really been tested, but only proclaimed: that there is a "clash of civilizations"

([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The\\_Clash\\_of\\_Civilizations](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Clash_of_Civilizations))

taking place between, roughly, "Christian Europe" on one side and the "Eastern" or "Arab" Islam on the other. Never mind the fact that Europe has lost almost all signs of Christianity many years ago. Never mind that Islam is neither primarily "Eastern" nor primarily "Arab". Never mind that Islam includes very different civilizations (from Morocco to Indonesia). Never mind that no Muslim or Islamic "civilization" has attacked any Western interests for a very long time. By the way - proponents of this theory include a theocratic and racist country such as Israel in the "Western", if not "Christian European", camp while ignoring the key role Muslim Turkey plays in NATO. Simply put – this view is 100% ideology, no facts are needed. And yet, there are quite a few groups in Russia which are happy to promote this worldview:

a) The Communists. In the bad old Soviet mentality, Islam is, as with any other religion, an ideological enemy. If Zyuganov & Co. do not speak of the "opium of the people" it is because they are afraid to antagonize their Orthodox Christian members, in particular, since nowadays being "Orthodox" gives you "patriotic" credentials. But being Muslim gives you exactly \*zero\* credentials with the Communists. If anything, they would be inclined to see Islam and Muslims as agents for foreign interests.

b) The Zionists. Contrary to the popular belief, there are still plenty of Zionists in Russia, including in the media, and they never miss the opportunity to fan the flames of Islamophobia. One of their favorite tricks is to always and deliberately conflate all forms of Islam, with the deeds of any "Muslim" whether actually religious or not and draw the conclusion that "Islam is our common moral enemy". For these people, Russia and Israel are natural allies against the common Islamic foe, and even Iran is not to be trusted. Needless to say, the Israelis go out of their way to court these circles and promote an image of "you had the Chechens, we have the Palestinians".

c) Russian neo-Nazi racists. This is really a small group, but an extremely vocal one. These are the famous Russian skinheads who feel that they are defending the "White Race" when they beat up a Tajik in the subway. Some of them claim to be Orthodox, though a majority like to seek their roots into some distant "pagan Russia" populated by blue eyed White warriors. These groups exist mostly on the Internet, but they sometimes gather in remote places to "train" for the "conflict to come".

Recently a group of real Russian patriots got together and began quietly investigating these groups. It turns out that the most vocal and racist of them all usually had IP addresses in the USA, Canada, and Israel. Russian security services strongly suspect that these groups are quietly supported by the US and other Western



intelligence services to create ethnic tensions in Russia. Unsurprisingly, since Putin came to power most leaders of these groups have landed in jail, or are hiding abroad.

d) Roman Catholics and Orthodox Ecumenists. Both of these groups share a common belief: whatever “minor” differences they “might” have had in the past, Orthodox Russia belongs with the “Christian West”, if only because both are “threatened” by a “common enemy”. These people carefully avoid ever mentioning the undeniable fact that Russia has always chosen Asia over Europe or Islam over the Papacy, if only because of all the wars of conquest which were waged by the West against Russia. This group has no traction in the masses of people, but it has some following in the pro-US circles in the big cities.

Individually, these groups are not very powerful, with the notable exception of the Zionist one. And they do not officially work together. But if there are no signs of a conspiracy, there is an objective collusion between these groups when it comes to demonizing Islam in all its forms, even the most moderate ones. This, in turn, means that there is a minority of the Russian population which will always view Islam as a threat, no matter what.

The good news is that these groups are counter-balanced by far more influential forces which see Islam as a potential (if not yet actual) natural ally of Russia. This will be the topic of the next installment.



## Russia and Islam, Part Five: “Islam” as an Ally

*“Russia has become the first enemy of Islam and Muslims because it has stood against the Syrian people; more than 30,000 Syrians have been killed by the weapons supplied by Russia”*

*Yusuf al-Qaradawi*

Reading the words of al-Qaradawi ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yusuf\\_al-Qaradawi](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yusuf_al-Qaradawi)), who is arguably one of the most influential Muslim clerics on the planet whose TV show is followed by 60 million Muslims, one might wonder how anybody could ever think of Islam as an ally of Russia. But then, reading the rest of the article which quoted him, we see that he also *“called on pilgrims to pray for the toppling (sic) of Bashar al Assad, elimination of the Syrian army, Iran, Hezbollah, China, and Russia”*. If we think of the logic of his own words, the list of enemies he names, and if we consider that he believes that Russia is the worst of them, does that not indicate that Russia must, therefore, be the main force behind the others, behind Syria, Iran, Hezbollah, and China? If so, then unless we assume that the Russians are irrational, we can probably conclude that Russia sees Syria, Iran, Hezbollah and China as allies which, of course, it does. And since Syria, Iran, and Hezbollah are most definitely Muslim, this clearly shows two fundamental things: there are many different brands of "Islam" out there (Hassan Nasrallah would definitely not agree with al-Qaradawi's point of view) and *some of these brands of Islam are already objective allies of Russia*. So, once again, we need to set aside the vast category of "Islam" and look a little deeper into what has been going on inside the Muslim world.

The following is a self-evident truism.

The Muslim world is not a united, coherent, entity with a common goal, ideology or ethos. While some Muslims want to entertain that fiction, and while *all Islamophobes are more than happy to support and propagate such claims*, they are patently false. While all Muslims share certain common beliefs, this list is extremely short. In fact, all that is required to convert to Islam is a single heartfelt recitation of the *Shahadah*: “there is no god but God; Muhammad is the messenger of God”. Everything else is left to the interpretation of the various sects and schools of jurisprudence. This is why all the usual generalizations about Islam are so misleading – they ignore the immense diversity of Islam, from Morocco to Indonesia, from Saudi Wahabism to Kazakh Sufism.

And yet, some generalizations can be made, even if accompanied by various disclaimers and caveats.

The first is that the richest segment of the Muslim world is definitely one of the types of Sunni Islam found around the Persian Gulf; in particular, the one represented by the Saudi type of Wahabism. This Saudi brand of Islam combines three separate elements into one explosive mix: **a primitive but extremely aggressive ideology, immense disposable income and a militant dedication to proselytism and expansion**

Second, Sunni Muslims are all potential targets of Saudi/Wahabi indoctrination and recruitment efforts. This does not mean that all Sunnis will turn into al-Qaeda types, but that Saudi/Wahabi recruitment efforts have already been successful in pretty much all Sunni groups, regardless of geography or tradition. Conversely, this also means that for traditional Sunni Islam the brand of Wahabism the Saudis are spreading is a most dangerous foe.

Third, The United States has to be credited with the following: they took a local, largely irrelevant sect and, with the complicity of the House of Saud, they literally federated all the Wahabi crazies worldwide into, if not one organization, then at least one movement. While the USA initially wanted to organize the resistance against the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, they have since always commanded, if not always controlled, these movements worldwide, and they are still doing so today. From the US and Turkish "black flights" in Bosnia to the arming of the KLA in Kosovo, to 9/11, to the uprisings in Libya and Syria, the United States has always directed the Wahabi crazies towards the enemies of the US global Empire.

Fourth, in contrast to the rest of the Islamic world, the Shia has always been a determined opponent of Wahabi Islam and the US Empire. Conversely, this also means that for the US Empire and the Wahabi crazies, the Shia are at the top of their enemy list and that they will spare no efforts into weakening, subverting or destroying any Shia movement or country. Remarkably, so far, they have failed and that in itself is a testimony to the formidable intelligence, courage, and resilience of the Shia people.

What does that mean for Russia?

While there are some circles which fully subscribe to the "clash of civilization" theory and who consider Islam as a threat (see in my previous installment (<http://thesaker.is/russia-and-islam-part-four-islam-as-a-threat/>) the "Islam through the prism of the "clash of civilizations" section), there are also several influential groups who very much see Islam as a natural ally:

### **Shevchenko :**

Orthodox patriots, best represented by the views of the well-known journalist Maksim Shevchenko

([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maksim\\_Leonardovich\\_Shevchenko](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maksim_Leonardovich_Shevchenko)) , are Russian nationals who, as patriots, not Russian nationalists, believe that Russia has a vocation to be a multi-ethnic country and civilization and who, as Orthodox Christians, believe that traditional Islam shares most, if not all, of the key values of Orthodox Christianity. Shevchenko, who is a long-time Orthodox activist, is also a specialist in the Caucasus region and who has extensive contacts in the various Muslim communities in Russia. Unlike the "Orthodox Ecumenists", Shevchenko has no interest at all in finding some theological common ground with Islam. For him, the value of Islam is what it stands for culturally and politically. The fundamental belief of Shevchenko and those who support his ideas is that traditional Islam is the natural ally of Orthodox Christianity and the Russian civilization in its struggle against both Western imperialism and Wahabi extremism. Needless to say, Russian Islamophobes absolutely despise Shevchenko and they regularly spread rumors about his (totally fictional) conversion to Islam.

### **Massoud:**

The security services. Russian security services have enough analysts and experts to fully realize the potential of an Orthodox-Muslim alliance against their common enemies. It is not a coincidence that a former KGB officer like Putin put so much effort in supporting the Kadyrov clan in Chechnia. There is an old tradition in the Russian security services to seek alliances with some Muslim movements against common enemies. From the long-standing alliance of the Soviet GRU with Ahmad Shah Massoud, to the SVR's support for Assad, to the FSB's support for Akhmad and Ramzan Kadyrov – the Russian security services have always sought allies in the Muslim world. They have always done this due to a mix of pragmatic considerations and real admiration

for their counterparts (I can personally attest to the real and sincere admiration in which Massoud was held by commanders of the Kaskad/Vympel Spetsnaz force). Putin has personally stated many times that the traditional Muslim communities can count on the absolute support of the Russian state and that this support for traditional Russian Islam is a key strategic objective of the Russian state.

### **Christian or Muslim?**

Orthodox traditionalists. If you look at a photo showing some of the dresses which would be considered traditional Orthodox dresses in modern Russia - though not exactly identical, they are very similar to what many Muslim women would wear, are they not? Now compare that with the kind of civilization model the various Pussy Riots, Gay Pride parades and other LGBT (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGBT>) movements present. The fact is that traditional Islamic and traditional Christian Orthodox ethics are very similar and that they stand for the same values: traditional families, moderate patriotism, social responsibility, modesty, sobriety, charity, honor, and respect for traditions including for other traditions. At a time when most Russian TV stations are spewing a constant stream of immorality, materialism, and outright filth, Orthodox Christians look with understanding and admiration at those Muslim families who raise their children with respect for their elders and the traditions they represent.

Recently, there have been a few high-visibility scandals around the issue of whether Muslim girls should be wearing a scarf over their heads in public schools. Just like in France, some Russians felt threatened by such religious displays, in particular in the southern regions of Russia where immigration is a big problem. Interestingly the traditionalist Orthodox commentators sided with the Muslim girls saying that they are actually giving a good

example to Russian Orthodox girls too. It is a fact that before the Bolshevik Revolution almost all rural Russian women wore a headscarf which is very much a traditional Russian way of dressing (those doubting this are welcome to check any Russian matryoshka doll. ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Matryoshka\\_doll](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Matryoshka_doll))).

### **The Russian foreign policy establishment**

The Russian foreign policy establishment, while not necessarily as pro-Islamic as the Russian security services, is also largely convinced of the importance of supporting countries such as Syria and, in particular, Iran, which most Russian diplomats see as a key Russian ally in the Middle-East. There is also, however, a strong pro-Western minority in the Russian Foreign Service which does believe that Iran has to submit to the orders of the UNSC even in cases where the UNSC takes decisions which are highly unfavorable to Russia. This is also the group which prevailed at the time when Russia betrayed Gaddafi and did not veto a resolution which was clearly designed to allow US/NATO aggression on Libya (Russia also betrayed Iran on several occasions at the UNSC). Still, the prevailing thought, in particular since Putin's return to power, is that Iran is an important ally that Russia must support.

The Russian state, as a whole, is not a unitary actor. In fact, there is a lot of very intense infighting taking place right now, and there is strong evidence that at least two clans, one associated with Medvedev and one associated with Putin, are now in the midst of a covert war against each other. This topic, and what that means for Islam, will be the subject of the next installment of this series.



## Russia and Islam, Part Six: the Kremlin

This is a topic which I have been most hesitant to cover for many reasons, including the fact that my views on this topic have come to change, and that they did so, not as a result of the discovery of indisputable facts, but under the combined action of much “in between the lines” readings of events, many indirect events pointing in the same direction, combined with a very strong, but inevitably subjective, gut feeling. To state my thesis bluntly, I have come to the conclusion that for many years already there have been several interest groups fighting against each other in the Kremlin and that one group has decided to break cover and engage in a quiet but still visible attack against the other. As a result of that, a profound revolution has now begun in Russia and that the next 4-5 years will see either huge changes or a major power struggle inside the Kremlin.

The Muslim world and the “Islamic factor” inside Russia play little or no role in this struggle, but the result of this struggle will define Russian policies both towards Muslims inside Russia and towards the Middle-East and the rest of the world. This is why I have decided to address this issue now.

In the past, I was of the opinion that Putin and Medvedev were the representatives of the same interest group which could be loosely described as a mix of security services and big money. I credited this group with very skillfully deceiving the US-controlled regime of Yeltsin and his Jewish oligarchs only to systematically crush it as soon as Putin came to power. I still believe that this model is fundamentally correct, but I now have also come to realize that it has a deeper dimension which I had missed in the past.



First, I used to see the events of 1999-2000 as basically a victory of the “Putin people” against the Jewish oligarchy (which it was) and against US interests. The latter is not so simple. Yes, when Putin came to power he did basically “decapitate” the top figures of the oligarchy, but he simply did not have the means to change the system which the oligarchs and their US sponsors put in place. **The people were changed, the system remained fundamentally the same.** Berezovsky and Gusinsky fled Russia, Khodorkovsky was offered a much-deserved trip to a tree logging camp in Siberia, but the system these guys had built stayed: the media toned down some of its most obnoxious propaganda (in particular on Chechnia); the “New Russian” millionaires stopped trying to simply buy the Duma (like Khodorkovsky had); the various separatists groups decided to keep a low profile; and the Russian mob decided to be more careful in its actions. But the basic laws, the Constitution, the system of government, all remained pretty much unchanged. Furthermore, inside the “Putin people” there were some who very much wanted to deepen the integration of Russia into the West and its US-controlled international system. Some were clearly CIA/MI6 paid agents of influence; others did that because they truly believed that this was the best course for Russia. These types of people were often seen “near” Medvedev, “near” both physically and ideologically. The 1990s also left a lot of these people in key positions in various government agencies, media groups, and business interests. No less important than who was “in” the power circles at the time is who was kept away. Some extremely popular figures were sent far away from the centers of power. This is well illustrated by the case of Dmitri Rogozin being sent to Brussels.

So what we have witnessed between 2000 and 2012 is a grand balancing act, a compromise, between, at the very least, two interest groups: I will call the first one the “Atlantic

**Integrationists”** and the second one the **“Eurasian Sovereignists“**. The first group wants Russia to be a respected strategic partner with the West while the second group aims at the creation of a multi-polar world in which no one country or alliance would hold supreme power.

Just as in the late 1990s the "Putin & Medvedev" people succeeded in outwitting the Jewish oligarchy, in the past couple of years the "Putin" people have, apparently, succeeded in outmaneuvering the "Medvedev" camp. I very much doubt that the people around Medvedev realized what they were doing when they let Putin run for President, officially under the argument that his popularity was higher than Medvedev's (which is true). They probably were told that another 6 years of compromise and continuity were ahead. But in reality, Putin has fundamentally changed the course of Russia since he came to power a year ago.

In the past, cracks between the two camps had already appeared over a number of issues, including the S-300 sale to Iran, the UNSC Resolution or the response to the 08.08.08 war against Georgia. But these differences were always settled under the fundamental fact that the role of the President and the one of Head of Government ("Prime Minister") were clearly defined and each had to remain within his own sphere of competence. Medvedev made the point himself when he publicly declared that the decision not to veto the UNSC Resolution on Libya allowing a US/NATO war was his personal one and that he personally instructed the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In contrast, Putin denounced this decision in no uncertain terms but could do nothing about it. Every time Medvedev and Putin butted heads over something, Medvedev's popularity sagged while Putin's rose.

**Serdiukov:**

This conflict came to a head around the person of Anatoly Serdiukov, the former, and now disgraced, Defense Minister. I will skip all the well-known details about how Serdiukov was caught, but I will state one obvious fact: neither the journalists who “uncovered” Serdiukov’s indiscretions nor the Investigative Committee which opened an investigation could have done so without the direct approval of the Presidential Administration. Just like Obama had to “clear” (read: instigate) the Petraeus scandal to get rid of a powerful figure and replace him with a loyal ally, so did Putin instigate the downfall of Serdiukov. Let me add here that the widely held belief that Serdiukov was Putin’s man is based on nothing but journalistic clichés and is irrelevant anyway. If, like I think, Serdiukov was imposed upon Putin by the "Atlantic Integrationists" then Putin would inevitably be considered as co-responsible for Serdiukov’s actions regardless of whether Putin wanted Serdiukov in the first place or not. And that made it very difficult for Putin to do something against “his” protégé.

The reason why I am focusing so much on Serdiukov is that in the Russian political system, the Minister of Defense is something of a mini-President: he runs what is truly a mini-state inside the bigger state, it is both highly autonomous and extremely powerful. As a result, the position of Minister of Defense is one of the most powerful ones in Russia. I find it also very plausible that the "Atlantic Integrationists" could have agreed to have Putin as a President, provided that Medvedev is #2 and Serdiukov #3. Medvedev is still #2, but Serdiukov has been ejected and disgraced, and his successor, Sergey Shoigu, is his polar opposite in almost every conceivable aspect.

**Shoigu:**

As soon as Shoigu took over the Ministry of Defense, he summarily kicked out Serdiukov's Chief of General Staff, General Makarov (a person of exceptional mediocrity), and replaced him with a highly talented and immensely respected combat officer, General Valerii Gerasimov who, in turn, brought back a long list of respected and highly competent generals to key positions in the Armed Forces. Shoigu also immediately reversed some of the worst excesses of the so-called "Serdiukov's reforms" in many fields including military education, medicine, command, and control, etc.

Predictably, and unlike Serdiukov, Shoigu has excellent relations with key personalities like Dmitri Rogozin, Vice-premier of Russian Government in charge of the defense industry, and Sergei Ivanov, Chief of Staff, Presidential Administration of Russia (both of which are suspected by many observers to have played a key role in the downfall of Serdiukov).

There are also other signs of a potential shift in the top echelons of power in Russia. More and more observers are speculating that Putin's All-Russia People's Front ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/All-Russia\\_People's\\_Front](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/All-Russia_People's_Front))

is being developed not only as a movement to generate new ideas, which is what it was supposed to be, but as a tool to influence and, if needed, replace the United Russia party ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United\\_Russia](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Russia))

which is seen as too much under the control of the "Atlantic integrationists". Again, this is speculation, but there are more and more well-informed observers who are predicting that Medvedev might not remain as Head of Government all too long. My personal take on that is that I get the feeling that Medvedev is a decent man, but of small political stature, who can be trusted to

administer and manage, but without much of a vision. Surrounded by powerful visionaries like Putin, Shoigu or Rogozin, he will do as he is told. But yes, if he does not, he will probably be ejected fairly soon.

Before turning to the next aspect of this process, I would like to introduce a thesis here which I rejected for a long while, but which I ended up accepting as true.

There is no doubt that in 1991 the Soviet Union lost the Cold War: the country was split into 15 separate pieces, the entire polity was brought down and the state practically ceased functioning, all the wealth of the country was brought under the control of Western interests and their proxies – Jewish oligarchs. Poverty literally exploded, as did the mortality rate. NATO pushed forward its forces right up to the border of the Russian Federation, and American "advisers" literally created the new Russian state, the constitution, the system of government and most laws. Now here is the key concept I want to submit: for all its external appearances of independence, **the Russian Federation between 1991 and 2000 became a US colony, a US dependent territory, something similar to the status of Iraq following the withdrawal of most American forces or the status of, say, Poland or maybe Romania during the Soviet era.** Anyone who has any doubts about this needs to carefully study the events of 1993 when the comparatively legitimate Parliament of Russia was shot at by tanks with the full "support" (read: under the control of), the USA acting through its Embassy in Moscow which, during those days literally became the command post for the entire crackdown on the opposition. I personally was present in Moscow during these events, and I had first-rate information about what was really going on at the time. I can, for example, attest to the following two facts: a) the number of victims was *grossly under reported* and b) the scope in time and space of the repression was also *grossly under reported*. The true

figures of casualties are close to 5,000 (five thousand) people and it took 5-6 days of combat in the entire Moscow metropolitan area (including areas outside the city proper) to eventually crush the opposition (I personally witnessed an intense firefight right under the windows of my apartment on the evening of the 5th day after the assault). This entire bloodbath was directed and coordinated by the USA via its embassy in Moscow and most of the atrocities were not committed by government forces in uniform, but by hired guns in plainclothes (including mobsters and Beitar squads) and without any legal authority. Does that not remind you of another capital? Yes, of course, that could have been Baghdad. Predictably the entire Western corporate press presented these events as a victory for democracy and freedom against the dark forces of revanchism, nationalism, and communism.

If we accept the thesis that Russia was de-facto a US controlled territory until 2000, we can then immediately understand the next key implication: **the coming to power of Putin did not, in itself, magically change this reality.** Think of other examples like Saddam Hussein or Noriega who used to be loyal US-puppets who eventually decided to take a more independent course? Did their countries change overnight? Of course not. The difference with Russia is, of course, that the US did not have the means to wage war on Russia, much less to occupy it and install another puppet regime. Even the terminally weakened and dysfunctional Russian state of the 1993-1999 years still had the means to transform all US major cities into a rubble of radioactive ashes. And yet, the Russian state could not even gather together enough regiments to deal with the Chechen insurgency. All that the Russians could send to deal with the Chechen insurgency was a limited amount of so-called "Mixed Regiment" (сводный полк – really mixed \*battalions\*), a mishmash of hastily clobbered together subunits which often had

no military training at all. Thus, by the time Putin came to power, Russia had a quasi-dead state fully controlled by the USA.

And yet, Putin achieved some kind of miracle. First, he skillfully crushed the Chechen insurgency. Then, he ejected the Jewish oligarchs which resulted in an immediate change in the tone of the media coverage of the war in Chechnia. Then he began to reassemble the state piece by piece and while rebuilding what he called the "verticality of power", meaning that he re-subordinated the various regions of Russia to the central government: mobsters were ejected from the gubernatorial seats they had purchased, the regions began to pay taxes to the Federal government (most had stopped) and Presidential envoys were sent out to restore order in the regions. If all this was a bitter pill to swallow for the British who had been deeply involved in breaking up Russia into many smaller pieces, it was really no big deal for the Americans who, at the time had more pressing issues to deal with: the Neocons had just successfully pulled off 9/11 and the Global War On Terror (GWOT) was in full swing. Besides, externally, Russia was playing it all very nice, actually helping the USA in Afghanistan. Logically, while the press in the UK was frantically cooking up all sorts of hysterically anti-Russian propaganda, the US press did not care very much.

I don't think that the Americans really liked Putin, but they probably saw him as a reliable partner that they could keep in check and who would not give them too much grief. Sure, he prevented the final break-up of Russia, but every good thing has an end and it would have been unrealistic by 2000 to expect another decade of Yeltsin-like chaos and collapse. Besides, it's not like Russia really had tossed off the American yoke: the system which the USA had created was still in place and there was only so much that Putin could legally do.

So between 2000 and 2012 Putin and Medvedev began a very gradual step-by-step process of internal reconstruction. In foreign relations Russia did a lot of zigzagging, sometimes acting in a way mildly irritating to the Americans, but always subservient when things got really important.

And then the USA did two truly dumb things: feeling buoyed by a sense of omnipotence and imperial hubris, the Americans let Georgia attack Russian forces in Ossetia and then they fully sided with the aggressor. That, combined with the maniacal insistence on deploying an anti-missile system around Russia resulted in a wave of anti-American anger in Russia which Putin fully exploited. The Americans probably figured that sure Medvedev was better, but they had already seen Putin in power, and it was no biggie – they could handle him too. Except that "Putin 2.0" was quite a different one from the original version.

There had been a warning sign which the West dismissed as just a political speech: Putin's speech at the 2007 Munich Conference on Security Policy

[http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/speeches/2007/02/10/0138\\_type82912type82914type82917type84779\\_118123.shtml](http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/speeches/2007/02/10/0138_type82912type82914type82917type84779_118123.shtml) )

in which he unambiguously stated that the USA's planetary empire was the number one cause of all the world's major problems:

***“The history of humanity certainly has gone through unipolar periods and seen aspirations to world supremacy. And what hasn't happened in world history?***

***However, what is a unipolar world? However one might embellish this term, at the end of the day it refers to one type of situation, namely one center of authority, one center of force, one center of decision-making.***



*It is the world in which there is one master, one sovereign. And at the end of the day, this is pernicious not only for all those within this system but also for the sovereign itself because it destroys itself from within.*

*And this certainly has nothing in common with democracy. Because, as you know, democracy is the power of the majority in light of the interests and opinions of the minority.*

*Incidentally, Russia – we – are constantly being taught about democracy. But for some reason, those who teach us do not want to learn themselves. I consider that the unipolar model is not only unacceptable but also impossible in today's world. And this is not only because if there was individual leadership in today's – and precisely in today's – world, then the military, political and economic resources would not suffice. What is even more important is that the model itself is flawed because at its basis there is and can be no moral foundations for modern civilization.*

This speech, with its unusually candid type of language, did create an initial moment of shock, but it was soon dismissed and forgotten. The Western reaction was basically "fine, you don't like us, but watcha gonna do about it?!" and a shrug.

What Putin did about it was to continue to systematically strengthen the state, launching the economy on a multi-year boom which even overcame the 2008 crisis, and slowly educating the people inside Russia on a new concept: "sovereignization" (суверенизация).

Sovereignization is a powerful concept because it combines a

diagnostic (we are not really sovereign) with a goal (we need to become sovereign). It is not directed against anybody, but anybody openly opposing it immediately looks bad. How can anybody legitimately oppose sovereignization? Furthermore, by introducing the concept of sovereignization, Putin pushed the people to ask key questions which had never been asked in the past: if we are not sovereign, why not? How did it happen that we are not sovereign? And who is really sovereign then? And what about those who oppose sovereignization, whose interests are they defending?

By the time the Americans realized that the genie had been let out of the bottle it was literally too late: by a single conceptual push the entire political discourse in Russia had been altered from a state of catatonic stupor to a potentially very dangerous cocktail of opinions.

And this time Putin did not stop at words: he also passed laws demanding that any foreign-financed NGO sign-up as a “foreign agent” and that any government employees with money or real estate abroad either justify its origin or resign. And these are just test runs, the big stuff is all ahead: Putin now wants to change the laws regulating the activities of the mass media. He plans to implement new legislation making it possible to incorporate major industries inside Russia (currently they are all incorporated abroad). He intends to change the taxation system of major foreign multinationals and, eventually and inevitably, he will have to initiate a revision of the Russian Constitution. Step by step, Putin is now using his power to change the system, cutting off each instrument of foreign control over Russia one after the other. Last, but not least, Putin has now openly embarked on a process to establish a new **Common Eurasian Economic Realm** (Единое Евразийское Экономическое Пространство) with any former Soviet Republic willing to join (Belarus and Kazakhstan are already

in) which will eventually become a new **Eurasian Union** (Евразийский Союз). This, of course, is utterly unacceptable to the USA, which is why Hillary Clinton took the unprecedented step to openly announce (<http://news.yahoo.com/clinton-fears-efforts-sovietize-europe-111645250--politics.html>) that the USA would do everything in its power to either prevent this outcome or, at the very least, to delay it:

***“There is a move to re-Sovietize the region. It's not going to be called that. It's going to be called a customs union, it will be called the Eurasian Union and all of that. But let's make no mistake about it. We know what the goal is and we are trying to figure out effective ways to slow down or prevent it.”***

This time around, however, it was Russia's turn to say “*fine, you don't like us, but watcha gonna do about it?! “* .

The fact of the matter is that there is precious little the USA can do about it. Oh sure, the US did raise a big stink about “stolen elections”, the Pussy Riot movement, Congress passed the Magnitsky Act

(<http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/112/s1039/text>),

and Hillary made her threats. But all that was way too little and way too late. By the time the Americans came to realize that they had yet another major problem on their hands, there was nothing much they could do about it.

This is not to say that there is nothing that they will do about it in the years to come. First and foremost, we can expect a surge in the number of terrorist attacks in the Caucasus and the rest of Russia. If Chechnia seems to be safe, at least for the time being, the situation in the neighboring republic of Dagestan is still very dangerous. Second, we can expect the anti-Putin propaganda to reach new heights. Third, the US CIA and MI6 will return to their

Cold War practices of covertly funding and directing a dissident movement. Finally, and if all else fails, the West might try to find some crazy “lone gunman” to get rid of Putin himself.

Putin and his "Eurasian Sovereignists" supporters are probably not a majority of the people at this time. Yes, they are in key positions of power and they can use what is euphemistically called the "administrative resource" (административный ресурс – the power of the state bureaucracy) to promote their agenda, but they will have to deal with a Russian intelligentsia which is still fiercely anti-Putin and with a media which is even more hostile to any idea of sovereignization. And yet, as long as Putin does not engage into any excesses, it will be awfully hard for the media to openly trash a political program aimed at the sovereignization of the Russian nation. This is why when Putin repeatedly referred to this idea in his Message to the Federal Assembly (full text here: <http://eng.kremlin.ru/news/4739>) the media either ignored it or played it down. And yet, gradually, this topic is becoming more and more common in the Russian political discourse, led by the very active Russian Internet (known as RuNet).

At this moment Putin has a very strong control of the state apparatus and most key positions in the Kremlin are in the hands of his allies. The state itself is in a halfway decent condition, still plagued by corruption and a legal system designed to make it ineffective. It will work when needed, but it is still far from being a well-oiled machine. The Russian economy is doing pretty well, in particular, compared to others, but it is still very heavy, often ineffective, and most revenue is still channeled abroad. Likewise, the Russian society is mostly happy that the 1990s are over, but the vast majority of people are still faced with many difficulties and hope for a better future. Finally, the Russian armed forces have suffered a great deal under Serdiukov, but they are already definitely capable of dealing with any realistically imaginable

conflict and they are gradually working on restoring their full-spectrum deterrent capability. In this context, Putin's chances are overall good, but this is far from a done deal and it would be very naïve to underestimate all the potential responses the US Empire could come up with to deal with this emerging threat to its domination.

The time frame to see what will happen is relatively short, 4-6 years max. If by the end of his term Putin does not succeed in his sovereignization program then all bets are off for Russia and since all parties, including the "Atlantic Integrationists" realize that the struggle inside the Kremlin is likely to only heat up. We can be sure that the next months and years will see a lot of political upheavals in Russia, possibly beginning with an open fallout between Putin and Medvedev.

And Islam in all that?

As I wrote above, neither the Muslim world nor the "Islamic factor" inside Russia is going to have any influence on the outcome of this struggle. At the most, the USA and their "Atlantic Integrationists" allies will use Islamic terrorists to destabilize Russia. But as long as the state remains organized and solid, no amount of terrorism will be sufficient to truly influence the course of events. Besides, a resurgence of Islamic terrorism in Russia might have the exactly opposite effect: it might convince even more Russians that they need a powerful and independent regime to protect the country.

However, the outcome of this struggle might have a deep effect not only on the "Islamic factor" inside Russia but on the Muslim world in general: **"Atlantic Integrationists" are by and large anti-Muslim and pro-Israel; they want to integrate Russia into a Western system of security as opposed to an Islamic one.** To one degree or another, "Atlantic Integrationists" are always the proponents of the "clash of civilizations" paradigm. In contrast,

**the "Eurasian Sovereignists", while not all necessarily pro-Islamic in any way, are all for a multi-polar world and they have no problem at all with the idea that one of these poles of power would be an Islamic one. In other words, the only circumstance when "Eurasian Sovereignists" see a threat in Islam is when Islam is used by the US Empire as a tool to destabilize those countries that dare resist the USA. From this point of view, there is an "Islam" in Bosnia, in Kosovo or in Chechnia which is a clear enemy of Russia, but there is an Islam in Iran, Lebanon or Kadyrov's Chechnia which is an objective ally of Russia. It is characteristic that the "Atlantic Integrationists" always see Israel as Russia's natural ally in the Middle-East while the "Eurasian Sovereignists" always name Iran.**

As long as these two forces continue to fight each other for the control of the Kremlin and Russia, the Russian policies towards Islam inside Russia and the Muslim world will be inconsistent, at times indecisive, and therefore only moderately predictable. My personal sense is that Putin and his "Eurasian Sovereignists" are currently in a much stronger position than their opponents and that is definitely good news for the Arab and Muslim world, in particular for Syria. This process is far from over and it would be unwise to make too many predictions about what Russia might do or to count on Russia to do the "right thing" just because logic would indicate that it should. The appalling example of Russia essentially giving the US/NATO a green light at the UNSC to invade Libya should serve as a reminder that Russia is still not truly sovereign and that it cannot be counted on to always resist the USA's immense power.



## **Russia and Islam, Part Seven: the Weatherman's Cop Out**

In the bad old days, when I used to do analysis for a living, I had a boss which always insisted that I offer him several possible outcomes. He wanted me to tell him, "either X or Y could happen, but if not, then Z is a definite possibility". In his mind, by covering all the possible outcomes our department's "analysis" would never be wrong, and he would always been seen as "systematic" and "competent" by his bosses. I always hated that. From my point of view, this is exactly what the local weatherman does when he predicts "a hot mostly sunny day, with some clouds and possible afternoons showers with local thunderstorms". This, of course, describes almost \*any\* day in Florida, but this is hardly an acceptable cop out for an analyst who, I strongly believe, should be paid not to list all the possibilities, but to make a prediction based on his knowledge and expertise. I still believe that the difference between a real expert and an ignorant "pundit" is that the former has the skills to make the right call, and yet I am about to do exactly what I dislike pundits so much for. I will mention possible events, some general trends, but without making any firm prediction. And I will do that for exactly the same reasons as the pundits. I am simply unable to confidently predict what will actually happen.

I can, however, draw a few basic conclusions from the preceding installments; the most important one is that Russia is in a state of high instability and of constant change.

To illustrate what I mean by this: I have written two descriptions of modern Russia which appear to be contradictory or even mutually exclusive, but which both contain more than a few factual truths.

## **Russia version one:**

Russia is a country which is in the process of finally breaking off from the Western domination which, depending on whom you ask, began in the 17th century, February 1917, November 1917 or 1991. Between 1991 and 2000 the entire political system was re-designed according to US orders (all key ministries at the time were literally crowded with US “advisers” who basically told their subservient Russian “Ministers” “do this, sign that”). As for the Russian economy, it was totally controlled by the Jewish oligarchs who basically plundered it and shared the proceeds with their US patrons. As soon as Putin came to power he embarked on a massive program to get rid of US “advisers” and Jewish oligarchs and that, of course, earned him the eternal hatred of the West. As part of this national liberation process, Putin has also given the full support of the state to the main traditional/historical religions of Russia, which in practical terms means Christian Orthodoxy and Islam (nominally about 40% and 7% of the population respectively; only a much smaller proportion of which are truly religious). Pro-Western religions (Papism, Protestantism, and Judaism) taken together account for less than 0.5% of the population. Likewise, there are no pro-Western political parties in the Russian Duma; not because of any “stolen” elections, but simply because these parties could not even make the needed 5% to get a single representative. In other words, it is reasonable to assume that only about 5% of the population of Russia has any sympathies with the Western cultural, economic, political or societal model and 95% of Russians clearly want another course for their country.

The example of Chechnia has proven that the combined efforts of local traditional Muslim forces and of the Federal authorities are capable of dealing even with the worst forms of Wahabi extremism. As a result of this, patriotic (but not



nationalist) Russians and Muslims are joining forces against a common enemy: the Anglo-intelligence services (CIA/MI6 & Co.) and their proxies, the Wahabi preachers and guerrillas.

The re-election of Vladimir Putin to the Presidency has now triggered a deepening and an acceleration of the movement initiated under his presidency during his first terms: following US advisers and Jewish oligarchs, it is now the turn of the proponents of the "Atlantic Integrationist" viewpoint to be given the boot: (<http://thesaker.is/russia-and-islam-part-six-the-kremlin/>) the process which began with the now disgraced ex-Minister of Defense Serdiukov and might well end with a dismissal of Premier Medvedev who, in many ways, is the lead representative of this "Atlantic Integrationist" worldview. Should that happen, and should the "Eurasian Sovereignists" (<http://thesaker.is/russia-and-islam-part-six-the-kremlin/>) gain full control over Russia's foreign policy, this will result in a major shift of Russian policies towards Iran whom the Eurasian Sovereignists always cite as the natural ally of Russia in the Middle-East.

Along with a revamping of relations with Iran, Russian foreign policy priorities will be, in order of importance, the establishment of a Eurasian Union, the deepening of the political collaboration with the SCO member countries and the BRICS countries; in particular, China and India. While Russia will continue to see the EU as an important economic partner, it will keep this relationship purely on an economically mutually beneficial basis with only "symbolic shows of togetherness". In the Middle-East, Russia will continue to staunchly support Iran and Syria with all available means short of overt military intervention.

## **Russia number two:**

Historically, Russia has always been an objective ally of Western imperialism, and this is unlikely to change in the foreseeable future. The main reason why Putin gave the boot to US advisers and Jewish oligarchs has little to do with some deeply-felt political beliefs and has everything to do with a typically Russian power struggle inside the Kremlin. The various factions in the Kremlin are now skillfully impersonating a conflict between pro-Western and nationalistic groups. This purely rhetorical propaganda campaign makes it possible for the Russian elites to remain in power. Once we realize that elites are only interested in one thing – their own power and wealth – we also can easily predict their view of the West. For these Russian elites, the West is primarily a source of more wealth and power; a giant which can be played against your opponents; an overlord which will let you share in the spoils of the vicious exploitation of Russia and its people as long as the West's interests are not truly threatened. Thus, it is equally obvious that the Kremlin will never openly challenge the West, much less do something which could truly trigger a determined response from the West.

Take the example of Chechnia: this conflict was “resolved” only when the West, busy with 9/11 and the GWOT, gave the “green light” to the Russian forces to butcher the Chechen people and install their own puppet-thug Kadyrov. The Russians have learned that simple lesson: as long as the West considers you “their SOB” then you are free to do pretty much anything at home; but if you decide to take an independent course, you end up like Noriega, Saddam, Gaddafi and Assad (this threat was openly made by demonstrators during the recent color-coded revolution attempt in Russia).

Yes, most of the highly visible Jewish oligarchs have been exiled and one, Khodorkovsky, is in jail. But what does this really mean? That these oligarchs, tired of their decade-long pillaging of Russia, have decided to follow the example of a satiated tick, and simply fall off their host, to go and happily digest their orgy of blood in a friendlier place: Israel, the UK or somewhere else in Europe. Every departing Jewish oligarch has now been replaced with another, equally predatory and cynical, oligarch (either Jewish or Russian). The system of predatory bloodsucking of Russia and its people is still very much in place and is unlikely to ever change.

As for religions – they are practically irrelevant to Russia. Each religious denomination in Russia has a traditionalist wing which is too small to ever make a difference, while the rest of the country is populated by people who are either wholly lukewarm or even hostile to any religion. The Orthodox propaganda finds some followers in Russia only because it provides for a "patriotic" substitute for the now discredited Marxism-Leninism. As for the Wahabi propaganda, the only reason why it is popular in some nominally Muslim ethnicities is that it gives a cachet of religious legitimacy to what could only be referred to as the basic thuggery of some ethnic groups which have lived from crime and robbery for centuries.

As for Russian foreign policy, it will continue to be a bizarre mix of petty grandstanding and grand collaboration with the USA and whoever has enough power to pressure the Russian elites. The only "natural ally" of Russia in the Middle-East is Israel; if only because both countries are run by pragmatic thugs who skillfully impersonate nationalists. The Russian mob and the Jewish Mafia are, for all practical purposes, one and the same phenomenon, and they have never ceased working together for their mutual benefit. Religion or ethnicity is irrelevant for these people whose only loyalty is to themselves.

So which version of Russia do you prefer? Which one do you believe is correct?

Personally, it is pretty clear that I think that version number one is the correct overall description of what is taking place. I cannot deny, however, that version two still has a lot of factual basis behind it. In fact, version two is very much the version which "Atlantic Integrationists" are instinctively comfortable with. And as long as the "Atlantic Integrationists" remain a powerful segment of Russian society, Russia number two will remain a reality, at least in part.

### **What does that mean for Muslims in Russia and abroad?**

From a pragmatic point of view, there is really very little Muslims can do to affect the processes currently taking place in Russia. Inside Russia, Muslims have no other option than to support the regime in power for a very basic reason: any "success" of Wahabi Islam in Russia will inevitably turn into a total disaster for all the Muslims affected by it. First, because Wahabi Islam is a direct threat to the traditions and culture of Muslims in Russia. Second, because, unlike what happened during the first Chechen war, Russia now has all the means to crush any separatist or extremist movement at any stage of its development, ranging from effective counter-intelligence work to the engagement of fully armed and trained units and formations in a spectrum of operations ranging from counter-insurgency to combined arms operations. Yes, there still are Wahabi terrorist attacks in Dagestan and southern Russia, and there are Wahabi preachers still involved in all kinds of murders of traditionalist Muslims, primarily in the region of Kazan but also in other parts of Russia. The primary

reason why this is still taking place is that the nuisance of these attacks is below the "reaction threshold" of the main Russian "power ministries" (State Security, Defense) and are dealt with mostly by the Ministry of Internal Affairs (sometimes assisted by *local* elements of State Security). After all, the murder of a few policemen or clerics is hardly a reason to justify the involvement of special forces or the military – the regular cops and courts should learn how to deal with this. But should the situation get out of control, then the "Federales" will show up and deal with it, rapidly and ruthlessly.

Outside Russia, Muslims are all more or less stuck into doing more of the same. Iran, Syria and Hezbollah can only keep hoping that Putin's Russia will be a better ally or partner than Medvedev's, while the bulk of the rest of the Islamic countries do not need to give Russia much thought at all, if only because pretty much all of the Muslim countries on the planet besides Iran and Syria are now firmly under the control of Uncle Sam who, of course, will tell them what to think, say or do.

## **The main paradox**

I wrote this series of articles on the topic of Russia and Islam because I saw both of these categories as a part of what I would call the global resistance against the West's imperialism. And most of my discussion has been focused on trying to see whether Russia would ever turn into a consistent part of this resistance or not. And my conclusion is, in this respect, a very hopeful one because I very much believe that Russia will not only turn into a consistent part of this resistance, but because I even see it as the most important and powerful actor in this movement (what other major country today has a population with only 5% of pro-Western elements and sits on top of a booming economy?). In

contrast, it appears to me that most of the Islamic *Ummah* is now firmly in the hands of the West, either openly (Jordan, Morocco, Indonesia, etc.) or through its Wahabi proxies (Qatar, Libya, Pakistan, etc.). In this context, the differences between the Egyptian *Ikhwan*, the “Syrian” FSA, the Palestinian Hamas, the Albanian thugs in Kosovo or the al-Qaeda constellation make very little difference to me. Fundamentally, they all, I repeat \*ALL\*, have been co-opted and are controlled by the USA, at least to a degree sufficient to be manipulated and used as proxies. Thus, from the Russian point of view, they are all potential, if not actual, enemies at least as much, if not more, than the regime of Saakashvili in Georgia or the Latvian and Estonian nationalists.

As far as I can tell, the Shia are the only Muslims still resisting the West's imperialism. And when I look at the actions of the Iraqi government, I cannot even say that all Shia resist, as even nominally Shia politicians can be found amongst Western collaborators. Finally, just one thought about what could have happened in Iran. If the Gucci Revolution of Rafsanjani & Co. had toppled the Islamic Republic immediately tells me that even the Shia world is not nearly as stable and contradiction-free as I wish it was.

## **Personalizing ideas**

I will now do something else which is usually a bad idea. I will speak of people rather than ideas. But I will do this only to illustrate a simple point. My belief is that Vladimir Putin, Ayatollah Khamenei, and Hassan Nasrallah are, or at the very least, should be natural allies. By extension, I would say that what these three people individually stand for should naturally bring them to support each other and join their efforts. The question is whether these political leaders will survive long enough to join forces.

My focus on "Russia and Islam" was probably flawed from the outset since it looked primarily at two high-level concepts whereas the most interesting developments are happening at a deeper, sub-national, level. Still, if my prediction about Russia proves to be correct, resistance in Russia to the West will soon go from sub-national to national level, and if by that time the Islamic Republic is still in power in Iran, and I believe that it will be, the potential of a Russian-Iranian alliance could become truly immense, particularly if it is supported by other countries elsewhere (Venezuela at the OPEC or China at the BRICS). Such an alliance could not only save Syria but also protect Lebanon – via Hezbollah – from a foreign takeover.

My only confident prediction is that Russia in 10 years will be dramatically different from the Russia of today. Whether that will be for the better or the worse is, unfortunately, not something I can predict with confidence, though my personal and very strong feeling is that it will be for the better, and possibly even for the much better.

As always, time will show.



## **Russia and Islam, Part Eight: Working Together, a basic “How-to”**

Today I am going to look into the topic of Orthodox and Muslim cooperation, suggest one possible approach to this issue and give a practical example where this could be done immediately and with great benefit for all the parties involved. I consider this post today as the eighth installment of my "Russia and Islam" series and I suggest that those who have not read them, take a look at the previous installments before proceeding:

- <http://thesaker.is/russia-and-islam-part-one-introduction-and-definitions/>
- <http://thesaker.is/russia-and-islam-part-two-russian-orthodoxy/>
- <http://thesaker.is/russia-and-islam-part-three-internal-russian-politics/>
- <http://thesaker.is/russia-and-islam-part-four-islam-as-a-threat/>
- <http://thesaker.is/russia-and-islam-part-five-islam-as-an-ally/>
- <http://thesaker.is/russia-and-islam-part-six-the-kremlin/>
- <http://thesaker.is/russia-and-islam-part-seven-the-weathermans-cop-out/>

For reasons obvious to anybody who has read this series, I will limit my scope to the topic of cooperation between Orthodox Christians and non-Wahabi Muslims. As an Orthodox Christian myself I do not believe that any cooperation is possible between the Orthodox Church and the Papacy or the Reformed/Protestant denominations, nor do I believe that there is anything to discuss



with the Wahabis. So when I speak of ‘Christian’ below this will strictly refer to Orthodox Christians and ‘Muslim’ will refer to any Muslim except the Wahabis.

### **The fundamentally misguided yet typical approach:**

Having had many opportunities to exchange views with Muslims from different countries and having also heard Christian and Muslim religious figures engaged in various debates, dialogs, and discussions, I can describe the typical scenario by which such dialogs are conducted.

Typically, both sides try to establish a list of all the issues Islam and Christianity agree upon. These include that God is love, that the Mother of Jesus was a virgin, that the anti-Christ will come before the end of time, that Moses was a great prophet, that angels are the messengers of God and many other things. Added to this list of topics of agreement are usually statements about how Christians and Muslims have lived in peace side by side and how this should continue today. This is a well-meaning and polite way to engage in a dialog, but this is also fundamentally misguided for the simple reason that it overlooks absolutely fundamental theological and historical problems. Let's take this one by one.

### **Irreconcilable theological differences between Christianity and Islam**

The highest most sacred dogmatic formulation of Christianity is the so-called “Credo” or “Symbol of Faith” (full text here: [http://www.goarch.org/en/chapel/liturgical\\_texts/creed.asp](http://www.goarch.org/en/chapel/liturgical_texts/creed.asp), And more info here: [http://orthodoxwiki.org/Symbol\\_of\\_Faith](http://orthodoxwiki.org/Symbol_of_Faith)). Literally, every letter down to the smallest ‘i’

(<http://www.xefer.com/2002/10/iota>) of this text is, from the Christian point of view, the most sacred and perfect dogmatic formulation, backed by the full authority of the two Ecumenical Councils which proclaimed it and all the subsequent Councils which upheld it. In simple terms – the Symbol of Faith is absolutely non-negotiable, non-re-definable, and non-re-interpretable. You cannot take anything away from it, and you cannot add anything to it. You can either accept it as is, *in total*, or reject it.

The fact is that Muslims would have many problems with this text, but one part, in particular, is absolutely unacceptable to any Muslim:

***“And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Only-begotten, Begotten of the Father before all ages, Light of Light, Very God of Very God, Begotten, not made; of one essence with the Father, by whom all things were made”***

This part clearly and unambiguously affirms that Jesus-Christ was not only the Son of God but actually God Himself. This is expressed by the English formulation “of one essence with the Father” (ὁμοούσιον τῷ Πατρὶ in Greek with the key term *homousious* meaning “consubstantial”). This is \*THE\* core belief of Christianity: that Jesus was the *Theanthropos*; the God-Man or God incarnate. This belief is categorically unacceptable to Islam which says that Christ was a prophet and by essence a ‘normal’ human being.

For Islam, the very definition of what it is to be a Muslim is found in the so-called “Shahada” or testimony/witness (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shahada>). This is the famous statement by which a Muslim attests and proclaims that “There is no god but God, Muhammad is the messenger of God”. One can often also hear this phrased as “There is no god but Allah, Muhammad is His prophet”.

Now without even going into the issue of whether Christians can agree or not that “Allah” is the appropriate name for God (some do, some don’t – this is really irrelevant here), it’s the second part which is crucial here: Christianity does not recognize Muhammad as a prophet at all. In fact, technically speaking, Christianity would most likely classify Muhammad as a heretic (if only because of his rejection of the “Symbol of Faith”). Saint John of Damascus even called him a ‘false prophet’. Simply put: there is no way a Christian can accept the “Shahada” without giving up his Christianity just as there is no way for a Muslim to accept the “Symbol of Faith” without giving up his Islam.

So why bother?

Would it not make much more sense to accept that there are fundamental and irreconcilable differences between Christianity and Islam and simply give up all that useless quest for points of theological agreement? Who cares if we agree on the secondary if we categorically disagree on the primary? I am all in favor of Christians studying Islam and for Muslims studying Christianity (in fact, I urge them both to do so!). And I think that it is important that the faithful of these religions talk to each other and explain their points of view *as long as this is not presented as some kind of quest for a common theological stance*. **Differences should be studied and explained, not obfuscated, minimized or overlooked.**

The next divisive issue is the historical record.

## **Christians and Muslims – friends or foes? What does history show?**

Another well-meaning and fundamentally mistaken approach often seen in dialogs between Christians and Muslims is the attempt to present the history of relations between these two faiths

as a long uninterrupted love-fest. This is factually wrong and naïve to the extreme.

First, both Muslims and Christians are human beings, imperfect and sinful human beings (both religions agree on that). Second, and just to make things worse, both Islam and Christianity have, at times, been official state religions, meaning that states acted in the name of their religion. As a result, there have been plenty of moments in history where Christians and Muslims fought each other. Yes, it is true that Muslims and Christians often did live in peace side by side, but unless one is a total bigot and ignoramus, it is simply impossible to ignore the fact that Christians and Muslims also waged war, persecuted and mistreated each other, sometimes viciously.

So what?

What needs to be established is not whether Christians and Muslims did wrong to each other in the past, but whether they can live in peace. And the answer to that is a resounding “yes!”. I know, some naysayer will immediately object that both Christianity and Islam have a mixed record of interpretation of whether converting the other to your religion is a religious duty or not. The point here is not whether some Christians or Muslims do (or did) believe that they have to convert each other at all cost, but whether there are those who do not believe so. As long as this is a possibility and compatible with one's faith this is sufficient.

I think that history, and plenty of statements from religious figures on both sides prove that this is possible – and that there is a preponderance of evidence to show that – that both Christians and Muslims can accept that the decision to be a Muslim or a Christian should be freely taken inside each person's heart without compulsion or even interference. The fact that it is possible to interpret Christianity and Islam differently is irrelevant as long as it is also possible to accept such a basic stance on religious choices.

Yes, I know that in Islam apostasy is a capital crime, but I also know that over the centuries Muslims have also chosen not to enforce this. It is not for me as an Orthodox Christian to dictate what Muslim leaders decide, but it is also clear to me that there are enough wise and pragmatic Muslim leaders out there to fully comprehend the consequences of a decision on their part to enforce the death penalty on somebody choosing to abandon Islam.

### **So where do we go from here?**

It is very simply to get Christians and Muslims to feel hostility towards each other. First, make a few theological statements which are unacceptable to the other party, call the other a heretic or unbeliever, then mention a few bloody and contentious episodes in history and soon you will have a very nasty situation on your hands. This is as easy as it is sterile as nothing at all can come from that.

Thankfully, it is just as easy to accept that there are irreconcilable differences between the core beliefs of both religions and that each person should have the means to freely make a choice between these two faiths according to his conscience. As for history, it is a no-brainer to accept that both parties have, at times, done wrong to each other and that we are not responsible for what happened in the past, but only for what we make of our present and future.

Still, having dealt with our differences, we still should ask ourselves whether we have something in common - a common interest, or common values, which we might want to jointly defend. And we most definitely do - our ethics.

## **The common ground – ethics:**

Any religion has two primary components: what it believes in, what it proclaims, and then the rules of life; the "how to" of daily existence which it mandates. In Christian terms, there is the *Doxa* (what you proclaim or glorify) and the *Praxis* (how you live your spiritual life on a daily basis). These are the basic rules common to most religions: not to kill, not to steal, to live a life of modesty, to protect the weak, etc. When comparing Islam and Christianity one can find both differences and similarities between their *praxis* and ethics. The differences in praxis are not that important because they mostly affect the private lives of the faithful: Muslims will fast during the month of Ramadan, Christians during the four major fasts of the year and on Wednesdays and Fridays. So let them, who cares? They really do not bother each other and, in fact, they are typically respectful of each other's traditions. On ethics, however, the two religions mostly agree both on a social/corporate and individual level and, with one notable exception which I will discuss below, Christianity and Islam have very similar ideas of what is right and wrong and what society should stand for or proactively reject. Rather than making a long list of what Islam and Christianity agree on, I will simply introduce a new actor for comparison's sake: the "post-Christian and secular West".

## **What does the post-Christian and secular West stand for today?**

First and foremost, the post-Christian and secular West stands for the freedom of each person to choose his/her own system of belief, code of behavior, system of morals, lifestyles, etc. In other words, the post-Christian and secular West categorically rejects the notion that something called "The Truth" exists. From that, it is

logically inevitable to conclude that there really is no "right" or "wrong" at all. In fact, a core belief of the post-Christian and secular West is that "your freedom stops where mine begins" (originally expressed

([http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Oliver\\_Wendell\\_Holmes,\\_Jr.](http://en.wikiquote.org/wiki/Oliver_Wendell_Holmes,_Jr.))

as "The right to swing my fist ends where the other man's nose begins"). Ergo – as long as others are not affected by it, you can do whatever you want. Each person has his/her 'truth' and what you consider right another person might consider wrong and vice-versa.

Second, and as a direct consequence of the first point, the post-Christian and secular West places the well-being of the individual above the well-being of the community. This is perfectly expressed by the famous "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness" phrase

([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Life,\\_Liberty\\_and\\_the\\_pursuit\\_of\\_Happiness](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Life,_Liberty_and_the_pursuit_of_Happiness))

of the US Declaration of Independence which states that these are the inalienable rights of each individual. The contrast with both Christianity and Islam could not have been greater since these religions consider that the real life is the Eternal Life; that the human being is called to be in obedience to God and that true happiness is spiritual and not earthly. In fact, while the West considers life as the highest value, Christianity and Islam welcome death and consider that dying in the name of God is a most desirable act of witness of God (martis in Greek has exactly the same meaning as shahid in Arabic: witness).

Finally, and as a direct consequence of the two points above, the only common value to all people in the post-Christian and secular West is, of course, money. Money is, literally, the only "common currency" of a society without any supreme values in which each person is free to define right and wrong as he/she

wishes. This results in an inevitable monetization of everything, including the life of a human being (<http://users.wfu.edu/palmitar/Law&Valuation/Papers/1999/Leggett-pinto.html>).

This is really a very minimal system of values, but it is plenty enough to make it the “anti-religion” par excellence. In comparison to that, the differences between Orthodoxy and Islam suddenly appear tiny, almost irrelevant. Today, this is best exemplified in Russia where both Orthodox Christianity and Islam are under a direct multi-level attack by the determined efforts of the post-Christian and secular West which spares no effort to subvert and destroy the values of these religions and replace them by Western “values” promoted in multi-billion dollar propaganda campaigns, including music, movies, books, fashion, TV, talk shows, stores, politicians, famous personalities, etc.

The recent and famous cases of Pussy-Riot and the supposed “right” of Russian homosexuals to organize “pride” parades in Moscow are the perfect examples of the kind of agenda the post-Christian and secular West is pushing nowadays. And although this is not reported in the Western corporate media, I can attest to the fact that Muslim leaders in Russia all perfectly understand that they are also under attack and that this is not just an “Orthodox problem”.

So what could they do about it?

## **A perfect opportunity – the Russian Constitution**

Russian politicians are not blind to what is going on and with the exception of a few pathologically naïve or dishonest “liberals”, they all understand that what is happening now is a clash of civilizations between the post-Christian secular West and post-Soviet Russia. The fact that this clash of civilizations is not only



ideological but also political and even military (as the examples of the Euromaidan in the Ukraine and the deployment of the US anti-missile system in Eastern Europe shows) only makes these matters more urgent.

It just so happened that the Russian Constitution (<http://www.constitution.ru/en/10003000-01.htm>) is celebrating its 20th anniversary and that possible changes to that Constitution are being discussed in many parts of Russian society. One of the most bizarre features of the current Russian Constitution is that it forbids the state from having any ideology. Article 13.2 of the current Constitution states that “No ideology may be established as a state or obligatory one“. The roots of this rather strange paragraph can be traced to a mix of the general rejection of the old Soviet official Marxist-Leninist Communist ideology and a transparent attempt of the foreign “advisers” to the Yeltsin regime in 1993 to make darn sure that nothing “Russian” would find its place in the new Russian Constitution.

Some Russian Orthodox politicians have suggested that this paragraph 13.2 should be expunged and that some formulation would have to be found to express the notion that Orthodoxy played a key historical role in the culture and system of values of modern Russia, that Orthodox values are the basis of the modern ideology of Russia. So far, no exact formulation has been suggested and there is even a debate whether such a phrase should be included in the Constitution itself or in its preamble.

Needless to say, even raising such a notion has resulted in an outraged reaction by the small but very vocal minority of pro-Western "liberal" politicians. More importantly, a lot of Russian Orthodox Christians also have deep reservations about the wisdom of such an amendment because it might alienate all the non-Orthodox people in Russia, which include not only Muslims or Buddhists but a probable majority of agnostics. Muslim leaders

have also expressed concern that this would officially place Islam in a 2nd-category religion status (even though that is exactly the status of Christian dhimmis (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dhimmi> under Sharia law) and given Orthodoxy a senior, leading role.

I strongly believe that this is the perfect example when Christians and Muslims can easily find a common ground and unite forces: why not simply recognize the special role of Orthodoxy and Islam in the historical formulation of the Russian culture, society and system of values?

First, this happens to be historically correct. Not only were there a lot of Muslims among the Mongols who occupied Russia, in particular in the late period of occupation, but the expansion of the Russian state included many areas with a majority Muslim population who became citizens of the Russian Empire. Muslims have fought in defense of the Russian state and nation in many wars from the times of Saint Alexander Nevsky to WWII to the 08.08.08 war against Georgia. Last but most definitely not least, Akhmad Kadyrov and his son Ramzan Kadyrov have played an absolutely crucial role in kicking the Wahabis out of Chechnya and thereby they not only saved the Chechen nation from what would have been an absolutely devastating Russian assault, but they also probably saved Russia from a very dangerous and bloody war in the Caucasus. The same can be said of the Dagestani men who for several days single-handedly fought the invading “Islamic International Brigade” of Shamil Basaev and Khattab from Chechnia in 1999 until the main Federal forces got involved. Modern Russia is, beyond any possible doubt, a multi-ethnic and multi-religious state whose well-being and prosperity depends in great part on the kind of Islam Russian Muslims will choose: the Islam of Ramzan Kadyrov or the “Islam” of Doku Umarov (the shaitan who fancies himself the “President of the Chechen Republic of Ichkeria and Emir of the Caucasus Emirate”).

Second, by acknowledging the role of both Orthodox Christianity and Islam the proponents of this constitutional amendment would gain the support of what is by far the largest segment of the religious population: there are Buddhists, Papists, Protestants, Jews and other religious denominations in Russia, but they are tiny compared to the big two. Personally, I would also include Buddhists in this list of "culture-forming" religions whose values are shaping Russian society if only because (unlike the other small(er) religions) they are truly indigenous to Russia whereas the other denominations are "foreign imports" which, of course, have the right to exist in Russia, but which have had exactly zero influence on the formation of the Russian national identity or system of values.

As for the nominally religious and mostly agnostic people, the mere fact that two (or three) religions are recognized in a special role should assuage their concerns about any one system of values or ideology becoming official at the expense of everybody else. After all, most people in Russia would agree that the ethics of Islam and Christianity have a lot in common. The only major societal and moral issue in which Orthodox Christianity and Islam really disagree on is the issue of capital punishment. But that is irrelevant since Russia has pledged a total moratorium on executions anyway (of all things, to join – what else? – the Council of Europe); besides a majority of Russians still remain in favor of the death penalty to the point that it might even be re-introduced in the future.

## **Conclusion**

Contrary to what a lot of people seem to think, cooperation between Orthodox Christianity and Islam is actually very easy to achieve. Both sides have to accept the fact of irreconcilable

theological disagreements, both sides have to accept that they did wrong each other in the past, and both sides have to affirm the right of each person to freely chose his/her religion, including the right to switch from one to another. So far that should be a no-brainer.

Next, Christian and Muslims need to define a set of civilizational issues that they fully agree on. Also a no-brainer.

Finally, both sides should systematically defend their cultural, social and civilizational values together, side by side. In fact, as long as their cultural, social and civilizational values are not in conflict with each other, Orthodox Christians and Muslims should defend the values of the other side on principle, as being \*Russian\* formative/foundational values. For example, Russian Orthodox Christians should defend the right of Muslim girls to wear a scarf in school and elsewhere. Not only because it is beautiful or because, before Peter I all Russian woman always wore the exact same scarfs, not only in church but all day long – but because the so-called “Islamic veil” is in no way a threat to Christianity: just look at an icon of the Mother of God.

Recently, an Orthodox church was burned down at night in Tatarstan by some Wahabi thugs. The local Muslim community got together and donated all the money needed for a full reconstruction. Likewise, in Chechnia, Ramzan Kadyrov has personally overseen the reconstruction of many Russian churches destroyed in combat or by the Wahabis and the local government has now allocated money for the construction of an Orthodox cathedral in the center of Grozny. In the meantime, the city authorities of Stavropol have ordered the destruction of two "illegal" mosques. That is in a city which has only one mosque – currently used as a museum, it's tiny anyway – and a Muslim population of anywhere 60,000 and 500,000 people (depends on who you ask and how you measure). The city authorities did

promise to build a full Islamic Center (with a mosque, school, hotel, etc.) which is great, but nothing has been done so far. Granted, the situation in Stavropol is particularly bad and it is complicated by many other factors such as the existence of nominally "Muslim" gangs of thugs and the hostility of the local popularization of what they perceive as the "Islamization" of their city and region. This is the exact type of case where the Federal authorities need to energetically intervene, as Putin has often done in such cases, and deal with this problem in what is referred to as "manual regime" (in contrast to the bureaucratic autopilot). Overall, so far, the record of Orthodox-Muslim cooperation is checkered.

If Orthodox Christians and Muslims could get together and jointly push for a change in the Russian Constitution this would not only get the job done, but it would herald a new era for Russia because it would send a strong signal to the local level in Russia (such as Stavropol) and abroad (Iran, Syria, Lebanon) that Russia has taken the fundamental decision to work with any Muslim party willing to do so on the basis of a few clearly defined, mutually accepted and simple principles.

### **Special words to any naysayers**

I personally find all of the above really basic and self-evident. But having met the naysayers from both sides, I know that some of you will not be convinced. You "know" that Christians are imperialists never to be trusted or the Muslims are out to establish a "world Caliphate" on our dead bodies. Okay. Now let me ask you the question Americans kids like to challenge each other with: "*and what are you gonna do about it?!'*". Expel all Muslims out of Russia and cut-off the Caucasus? Kill all of *the Kufars* and organize an Islamic Caliphate in Russia? Fight the righteous struggle against

everybody and all fronts at the same time all on your own? Convince everybody to convert?

I don't think so.

In fact, by doing any of that all you are going to do is to do *exactly* what the Western political elites really want you to do! You do that and nobody will be happier than the Tamir Pardo, Zbigniew Brzezinski and Hillary Clinton. Politics is the art of the possible and to aim at the impossible is simply one form of political suicide. Those who desperately want to pit Christians against Muslims will never achieve anything but delivering yet another blow against the very religion they claim to defend. In my experience, these people have a very poor and superficial religious education and typically no historical education at all. They mistake their hatred for the "other" for a God-pleasing religious zeal, and they act not so much out of love for their own religion, as out of hate for the religion of the other. These are the folks who simply cannot see, in the beautiful words of Alexander Solzhenitsyn (<http://www.roca.org/OA/36/36h.htm>) that:

*“All attempts to find a way out of the plight of today's world are fruitless unless we redirect our consciousness, in repentance, to the Creator of all: without this, no exit will be illumined, and we shall seek it in vain. The resources we have set aside for ourselves are too impoverished for the task. We must first recognize the horror perpetrated not by some outside force, not by class or national enemies, but within each of us individually, and within every society. This is especially true of a free and highly developed society, for here, in particular, we have surely brought everything upon ourselves, of our own*

*free will. We ourselves, in our daily unthinking selfishness, are pulling tight that noose...*

God-fearing and pious Muslims and Christians alike must realize and accept that humility and sincere repentance for *our own sins* are what God calls us to do and that seeking an external enemy to fear and hate is not profitable for our souls. Our diversity of beliefs has no other cause than our *own* sinfulness, which itself is a direct consequence of our *common* humanity, a humanity which we *all* share regardless of our beliefs. Having found and espoused the True faith does not necessarily make us better people at all, it only makes us more fortunate and privileged ones, and that privilege places a special burden upon us to show forgiveness and compassion towards our erring fellow human being. Finally, if our goal is really to convert the other one, the best way to do that is by our individual *example* of true piety, purity, and love and not by "winning" a political struggle.



# **Russia and Islam, Part Nine: Connecting the Dots and Discerning the Future**

June 18, 2017

Russia has often been in the news over the past years, mostly as the demonized "Empire of Mordor" responsible for all the bad things on the planet, especially Trump's victory over Hillary Clinton, the Russian intervention in Syria and, of course, the "imminent" Russian invasion of the Baltics, Poland or even all of Western Europe. I won't even dignify all this puerile nonsense with any attention, but instead, I will focus on what I think are important developments which are either misunderstood or completely ignored in the West.

**First, a few key dots:**

## **1) The Russian intervention in Syria**

There are so many aspects of the Russian military intervention in Syria which ought to be carefully studied that I am confident that many Ph.D. theses will be written on this topic in the future. While I have mostly focused my work on the purely military aspects of this campaign, it is important to look at the bigger picture. To do that, I will make the admittedly risky assumption that the civil war in Syria is pretty much over. That is not my conclusion only, but also an opinion voiced by an increasing number of analysts including a Russian general during an official briefing. With the fall of Aleppo and now the latest Syrian-Hezbollah-Russian move to cut off the US controlled forces from their planned move to the Iraqi border, things do indeed look pretty bleak for the terrorists, the "good ones" and the "bad ones".



In the Syrian-Russian-Hezbollah controlled areas, normal life is gradually returning and the Russians are pouring huge amounts of aid (food, medical supplies, mine clearing, engineering, etc.) into the liberated areas. When Aleppo was under Takfiri control it was the center of attention of the western media, now that this city has been liberated, nobody wants to hear about it lest anybody become aware of what is a huge Russian success.

Even more impressive is the nature of the Russian forces in Tartus and, especially, in Khmeimim. The Russian military TV Channel "Red Star" has recently aired two long documentaries about the Russian facilities in Syria and two things are clear: first, the Russians are going to stay for a very long time and, second, they have now completed an advanced resupply and augmentation infrastructure which can accommodate not only small and mid-size aircraft and ships, but even the immense An-124. The Russians have dug in, very very deep, and they will fight very hard if attacked. Most importantly, they now have the means to bring in more forces, including heavy equipment, in a very short time.

Again, this might be a premature conclusion, but barring any (always possible) surprises, the Russians are in, Assad stays in power, the Takfiris are out and the civil war is over.

Conversely, this means that the USA lost the war, as did the KSA, Qatar, Israel, France, the UK and all the other so-called "friends of Syria". The Iranians, Hezbollah and the Russians have won.

So what does all this *really mean*?

The most radical consequence of this process is that Russia is back in the Middle-East. But even that is not the full story. Not only is Russia back, but she is back in force. Even though Iran has actually made a bigger effort to save Syria, the Russian intervention, which was much smaller than the Iranian one, was far more visible and it sure looked like "Russia saved Assad". In reality,

"Russia saved Assad" is a gross over-simplification, it should be "the Syrian people, Hezbollah, Iran, and Russia saved Syria", but that is how most people will see it, for better or for worse. Of course, there is more than a kernel of truth in that view as without the Russian intervention, Damascus would have probably fallen to the Daesh crazies and all the other Christian or Muslim denominations more or less wiped out. Still, the perception is that Russia single-handedly changed what appeared as an inevitable outcome.

The Russian success was especially amazing when compared to the apparently endless series of defeats for the United States: Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Libya, Pakistan and now the latest mess with the Saudi blockade against Qatar – the Americans just don't seem to be able to get anything done. Just the contrast between the way the US betrayed Hosni Mubarak with how the Russians stood by Assad is a powerful message to all the regional leaders: better to have the Russians on your side than the Americans.

## **2) How Russia transformed Turkey from an enemy to a potential ally**

To say that Turkey is a crucial ally of the US and a vital member of NATO is an understatement. For one thing, Turkey has the 2<sup>nd</sup> largest army in NATO (the US being the biggest one, of course). Turkey also holds the keys to the Mediterranean, NATO's southern flank, and the northern Middle-East. Turkey has a common border with Iran and a maritime boundary with Russia (over the Black Sea). When Turkey shot down a Russian SU-24 bomber (with US complicity) the situation became so tense that many observers feared that a full-scale war would break out between the two countries and, possibly, the NATO alliance. Initially, nothing happened, the Turks took a hard stance, but

following the coup against Erdogan (also with US complicity), the Turks suddenly did an amazing 180 and turned to Russia for help. The Russians were only too glad to help, of course.

We will never really know what role the Russians really played in saving Erdogan, but it is pretty clear, even by his own words, that Putin did something absolutely crucial. What is indisputable is that Erdogan suddenly moved away from the USA, NATO, and the EU and turned to the Russians who immediately used Turkey's ties with the Takfiris to get them out of Aleppo. Then they invited Turkey and Iran to negotiate a three-way deal to end the civil war. As for the Americans, they were not even consulted.

The example of Turkey is the perfect illustration of how the Russians turn “*the enemies into neutrals, neutrals into friends and friends into allies*”. Oh sure, Erdogan is an unpredictable and, frankly, unstable character; the Americans and NATO are still in Turkey, and the Russians will never forget the Turkish support for the Takfiris in Chechnia, Crimea, and Syria or, for that matter, the Turkish treacherous attack on their SU-24. But neither will they show any external signs of that. Just like with Israel, there is no love fest between Russia and Turkey, but all the parties are supremely pragmatic and so everybody is all smiles.

Why does this matter?

Because it shows how sophisticated the Russians are, how instead of using military force to avenge their SU-24, which is what the Americans would have done, they quietly but with great resolve and effort did what had to be done to “de-fuse” Turkey and “turn” it. The day following the Turkish attack Putin warned that Turkey would not “get away with just some tomatoes” (referring to the Russians sanctions against Turkish imports). Less than a year later, the Turkish military and security services got almost completely de-fanged in the purges following the coup against Erdogan and

Erdogan himself flew to Moscow to ask to be accepted by the Kremlin as a friend and ally. Pretty darn impressive, if you ask me.

### 3) Russia and the “Chechen model” as a unique case in the Muslim world

Many observers have commented in awe at the miracle Putin and Ramzan Kadyrov pulled-off in Chechnia: after the region was absolutely devastated by two vicious and brutal wars and after being a “black hole” for assorted terrorists and common thugs, Chechnia turned into one of the most peaceful and safe parts of Russia (even while neighboring Dagestan is still suffering from violence and corruption). I won’t revisit it all and describe all the dramatic changes in Chechnia, but I will focus on an often ignored aspect of the “Chechen model”: Chechnia has become an extremely strict and traditional Sunni Muslim region. Not only that, but it is also one which has basically comprehensively defeated not only the Wahabis themselves but also their Wahabi ideology. In other words, *Chechnia today is unique in that this is a Sunni Muslim culture which is strictly Islamic but with no risk whatsoever of being re-infected by the Wahabi virus.* It is difficult to overstate the importance of this unique feature.

In the 1990s most of the Muslim world supported the Wahabi insurgency in Chechnia in a completely knee-jerk reaction I call “wrong or right – my Ummah”. This is largely the result of the very sophisticated AngloZionist propaganda aimed at the Muslim world which completely distorted the truth about the conflict taking place there (the same happened in Bosnia, by the way). Nowadays, however, the “Chechen example” is attracting a great deal of attention in the Muslim world and the personality of Ramzan Kadyrov is slowly becoming somewhat of a hero. Even the Saudis who financed a great deal of the Chechen insurgency and who

threatened Russia with terrorist attacks during the Sochi Olympics, now have to be very courteous and "brotherly" with Ramzan Kadyrov. The truth is that the Saudis are directly threatened by the "Chechen model" because it proves something the Saudis want to categorically deny: the traditional and strict Islam does NOT have to be Wahabi or, even less so, Takfiri.

Think of it: the biggest threat to the Saudis is, of course, Iran because it is a powerful, successful and dynamic Islamic Republic. But at least Iran is Shia and that, in the minds of some Sunnis, is a grievous heresy and almost a form of apostasy. But the Chechens are potentially much more dangerous to the Saudi ideology – they are anti-Wahabi (they call them "shaitans" or, literally, "Devils") and they are willing to fight anywhere in the Muslim world to counter the "good terrorists" supported by the CIA and the House of Saud. Time and time again, Ramzan Kadyrov and many other Chechen leaders and commanders have repeated that they are willing to fight for Russia "anywhere on the planet". They have already been deployed in Georgia, Lebanon, Novorussia and now they are fighting in Syria. Each time with devastating effectiveness. They are true Muslim heroes, recognized as such even by the non-Muslim Russians, and they want absolutely nothing to do with the Wahabis whom they hate with a passion. As a result, more and more people in the Muslim world are expressing their admiration for the Chechen model.

The Chechen model also is noticed and hotly debated inside Russia. Russian liberals absolutely hate it and, just like their western curators, they accuse Kadyrov of all sorts of unspeakable crimes. Their latest invention is that homosexuals are jailed and tortured by the Chechen security service. These kinds of stories might be taken seriously in San Francisco or Key West, but they get zero traction with the Russian public.

Chechnia is ideally located to influence, not only the Caucasus but also other Muslim regions of Russia and even Central Asia. The large number of Chechens in the Russian special operation forces also makes them very visible in the Russian media. All this contributes to the high-visibility and popularity of a viable traditional Sunni model which is the exact opposite of what is happening in the EU. Let's compare the image of Muslims in the EU and in Russia.

A couple of important caveats first. First, the picture was not always quite as rosy, especially not in the 1990s when Chechens were seen as thugs, brutes, crooks and vicious terrorists. Some Russians have neither forgotten nor forgiven (and, of course, some Chechens still hate Russians for what they did to Chechnia during the two wars). Second, this table compares what I call "ethnic Muslims" in Europe, meaning people coming from Muslim countries or families who are not necessarily true, pious, Muslims at all. In fact, most of them are not. This is why I put "Muslims" in quotation marks. When I speak of Chechens, I refer to those conservative Chechens who support Kadyrov and his strict adherence to Islamic values. So, in a way, I will be comparing apples and oranges, but I do so because I want to show the greatest contrast possible and I believe that these apples and oranges play a crucial role in the development of the societies they live in now.

“Muslims” in the EU	“Kadyrov Chechens” in Russia
Seen as aliens/immigrants/"others"	Seen as neighbors/locals
Seen as disruptive of the local culture	Seen as representing a conservative/traditionalist strand in the Russian society
Seen as potential terrorists	Seen as the prime victims of, and allies against, terrorism
Seen as disloyal to the native people	Seen as the most loyal defenders of the Motherland
Seen as criminals and hooligans	Seen as “law and order” types
Seen as lazy welfare leeches	Seen as hard-working and skilled businessmen

Again, these are not scientific findings, they are not backed by careful opinion polling and they do compare apples and oranges. So take them with a big bag of salt. And yet, I think that what this table shows are deep and contrasting trends inside the EU and Russian societies: the EU is on a collision course with the Islamic world while Russia is not. In fact, Russia represents a model of how a (nominally) Christian society can coexist with a large Muslim minority to the benefit of both communities. Russia also represents a unique example of how two very different religions can contribute to the development of a \*joint\* civilizational model.

### **Now an attempt at discerning the future**

So let's connect the dots above: First, Russia is arguably the single most important actor in the Middle-East, far eclipsing the

United States. Second, Russia has successfully built an informal, but crucial, alliance with Iran and Turkey and these three countries will decide the outcome of the war in Syria. Third, Russia is the only country on earth where Sunni Islam is truly safe from the Wahabi virus and where a traditionalist Sunni society exists without any Saudi interference. Combine these three and I see an immense potential for Russia to become the force which will most effectively oppose the power and influence of the Saudis in the Muslim world. This also means that Russia is now the undisputed leader in the struggle to defeat international Takfiri terrorism (what Trump – mistakenly – calls “Islamic fundamentalism”).

The AngloZionist rulers of the Empire have been very clever, if also very short-sighted: First they created al-Qaeda, then unleashed it against their enemies, then they used al-Qaeda/ISIS/Daesh to wreak havoc on a number of secular regimes just to "re-shape" a "new Middle-East" and now they are finally using al-Qaeda/ISIS/Daesh to set the West on a direct collision course with the entire Muslim world (1.8 billion people!) which will prevent the imperial slaves, that is all of us, the common folks living in the EU and the USA, from ever looking at the real cause of our problems or, even less so, overthrow our rulers.

Thus we see the disgraceful and, frankly, stupid propaganda against Muslims and Islam as if somehow there was a real Muslim or Islamic threat. The reality, of course, is that all those Muslims who do represent a real threat to the people in the West are invariably associated with Western security services and that since 9/11 the vast majority of terror attacks have been false flags. True, there were some apparently "real" (that is: undirected by Western special services) attacks, but the number of victims in such, frankly, amateurish attacks was minuscule and blown out of proportion.

Just like the “thug life” musical propaganda in the USA resulted in large numbers of US Blacks being killed, mostly by



shooting each other, so the “Islamic terrorist” hysteria in the media will result in a few genuine terrorist attacks. But if you add up all the numbers you quickly realize that this paranoid hysteria is completely out of proportion with the real danger.

**Somebody wants us all to be afraid, really afraid.**

Sadly, this hysteria has affected many, not only in the official Ziomeia but also in the so-called ‘alternative’ media. The result? Just as the rulers of the Empire need it, the West and the Islamic world are now on a collision course. Who is your money on in this clash? Just take a look at the clowns we have for leaders and tell me that the West will win this one!

The West will, of course, lose this war too, but the consequences of this defeat are not the topic of this article. What I am trying to illustrate here is that the West and Russia have taken radically different approaches to the challenges of an increasingly more influential Islamic world. I would compare Russia and the West to two swimmers caught in a powerful riptide: the West is determined to swim directly against it while Russia uses this riptide to get where she wants. Again, who do you think will fare better?

But this is not just about the West anymore; this is about the multi-polar world which will replace the current AngloZionist hegemony. In this context, one of the most interesting processes taking place is that Russia is becoming a major player in the Muslim world.

Only 10 to 15 percent of Russians are Muslim, which amounts to about 10 million people. Most Muslim countries are way bigger. And since 85 to 90 percent of Russians are not Muslims, the influence of Russia in the Muslim world cannot be measured by such relatively modest numbers. However, when we consider the central role Russian Muslims play in the Russian policies towards the Caucasus, Central Asia, and the Middle-East; when we take into account that Russian Muslims are mostly Sunni and very well

protected against the virus of Wahabism, and when we recall that traditional Sunni Islam has the full backing of the Russian state we can truly get a sense of the unique combination of factors which will give the Russian Muslims an influence far in excess of their relatively modest numbers.

Furthermore, the Russians are now closely collaborating with Shia Iran and with (mostly) Hanafi Turkey. Most Chechens belong to the Shafi Sunni tradition and about half are adherents to Sufism. It might be because Russia is not a majority Muslim country that she is the ideal place to re-create a non-denominational form of Islam, an Islam which would be content to be Islam and with no need to subdivide itself into competing, sometimes even hostile, subgroups.

Russia only has an observer status in the Organization of Islamic Cooperation (OIC) due to the fact that she is not a majority Muslim country. Russia is also a member of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) which brings together China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, India, and Pakistan. Let's look at the approximate number of Muslims ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Islam\\_by\\_country](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Islam_by_country)) in the SCO countries: China 40,000,000 , Kazakhstan 9,000,000, Kyrgyzstan 5,000,000, Russia 10,000,000, Tajikistan 6,000,000 , Uzbekistan 26,000,000, India 180,000,000, Pakistan 195,000,000. That's a grand total of 471 million Muslims. Add to this figure the 75,000,000 Iranians which will join the SCO in the near future (bringing the grand total to 546,000,000) and you will see this stunning contrast: while *the West has more or less declared war on 1.8 billion Muslims, Russia has quietly forged an alliance with just over half a billion Muslims!*

Russian nationalists (as opposed to Russian patriots) did try their best to infect Russia with her own brand of Islamophobia, but that movement was defeated by an absolutely uncompromising

stance by Vladimir Putin himself who went as far as stating that:  
(<https://youtu.be/nqyVYtWB894>)

*“I need to say that, as I have repeated many times before, from its beginning Russia had formed as a multiconfessional and multiethnic state. You are aware that we practice Eastern Christianity called Orthodoxy. And some theorists of religion say that Orthodoxy is in many ways closer to Islam than to Catholicism. I don't want to evaluate how true this statement is, but in general, the coexistence of these main religions was carried out in Russia for many centuries. Over the centuries we have developed a specific culture of interaction, that might be somewhat forgotten in the last few decades. We should now recall those, our national roots.”*

Clearly, as long as Putin and those who support him remain in power, Islamophobia will have no future whatsoever in Russia.

[Sidebar: while this is never mentioned anywhere in the Western literature, there are real political prisoners in Russia and there is one group of people which the Kremlin has truly persecuted on political grounds: the Russian nationalists. This topic would deserve an article on its own, but here I will just say that since Russia is a state where the rule of law is official policy, the Kremlin has to resort to some creative tricks to jail these nationalists including accusing them of "attempting to overthrow the state by using crossbows" (I kid you not!)]

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vladimir\\_Kvachkov\\_%22%20/1%20%22The\\_Crossbow\\_Coup](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vladimir_Kvachkov_%22%20/1%20%22The_Crossbow_Coup)).

Nationalists are often persecuted on charges of violating laws against hate speech, for distributing extremist literature, etc. Basically, the authorities harass them and try to disrupt their activities. Again, the western champions of civil rights and various Putin-haters never speak about these very real political persecutions in Russia. Apparently western human rights organizations live by the motto of the "Angel of Death" of the French Revolution's infamous "terror" period, Louis Antoine de Saint-Just

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Louis\\_Antoine\\_de\\_Saint-Just](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Louis_Antoine_de_Saint-Just)), who famously declared "*pas de liberté pour les ennemis de la liberté*" (no freedom for the enemies of freedom). It is clear that as soon as Putin came to power he immediately realized the potential danger to the Russian society posed by these nationalists and he decided to clamp down on them every bit as hard as he did on the Wahabi recruiters and neo-Nazis propagandists in Russia.]

Furthermore, Russia has now become the most influential member of the SCO which represents the strategic interests of over half a billion Muslims worldwide. In the Middle-East, Russia has made an amazing comeback – from a quasi-total departure in the 1990s to becoming the single most influential player in the region. Russia has successfully convinced two very powerful potential competitors (Iran and Turkey) to work together and now this informal alliance is in a very strong position to influence the events in the Caucasus and Central Asia. At this point, it is already clear

that what we are seeing is a long term process and a long-term strategic goal of Russia: to become directly involved in the struggle for the future of Islam.

## **The struggle for the future of Islam**

The Islamic world is facing an immense challenge which is threatening its very identity and future: the Wahabi-Takfiri ideology. That ideology, by its very nature, represents a mortal threat to any other form of Islam and a moral threat, literally, to every non-Takfiri Muslim living on the planet. The Takfiri ideology also represents a real existential threat to all of mankind, very much including Russia and Russia cannot simply sit back and wait to see who of the AngloZionist West or the wannabe Caliphate of Daesh will prevail, especially since the two are also locked in a weird symbiotic relationship between the western deep state and special services and the Takfiri leaders. Furthermore, assuming the West is willing to seriously fight terrorism (and so far there is no sign of that whatsoever) it is also obvious that Europe is useless in this struggle (due to an acute lack of brain, spine and other body parts) and that the USA, being protected by large oceans, are not facing the same threat as the states of the Eurasian landmass. Russia, therefore, has to act on her own, and very forcibly.

This is not a struggle which will be determined by military means. Yes, being willing and capable of killing Takfiris is important, and Russia can do that, but at the end of the day it is the Takfiri ideology which must be defeated and this is where the Russian Muslims will play an absolutely crucial role in the struggle for the future of Islam. Their status as a minority in Russia actually serves to protect Russian Muslims simply because there is absolutely no possibility whatsoever for any type of Wahabi Islam

to gain enough traction in Russia to threaten the state. If anything, the two wars in Chechnia are the best proof that even in the worst possible conditions Russians will always hit back and very hard at any attempt to create a Wahabi state inside, or next to, Russia. President Putin often says that Russia has to send her forces to fight in Syria not only to save Syria but also to kill the many thousands of Russian citizens who are currently in the ranks of Daesh before they come back home: better to fight them there than to fight them here. True. But that also means that Russia will have to take the ideological fight to the rest of the Islamic world and use her influence to support the anti-Takfiri forces currently struggling against Daesh & Co worldwide.

The future of Russia and the Muslim world are now deeply intertwined which, considering the current disastrous dynamic between the West and the Muslim world, this is a good thing for everybody. While the leaders of the AngloZionist Empire are using both Russia and the Muslim world as bogeymen to scare their subjects into submission to the international plutocracy, Russia will have to become the place where the Islamophobic myths will be debunked and a different, truly multi-cultural, multi-religious and multi-ethnic civilizational model offered as an alternative to the monolithic Hegemony dominating the world today.

Modern secularist ideologies have given mankind nothing except violence, oppression, wars and even genocides. It is high time to kick them into the trash heaps of history where they belong and return to a truly tolerant, sustainable and humane civilizational model centered around spiritual, not materialistic, values. Yes, I know, for the media-brainwashed zombies out there religion is not exactly associated with the ideas of tolerance and compassion, but that is just the inevitable consequence of being exposed to particularly nasty and hypocritical forms of religion. That, and a basic lack of education. These things can be remedied,

not so much by debating them *ad nauseam* but simply by creating a different civilizational model. But for that, Russia and the Islamic world will need to look inside themselves and focus on healing their own (still numerous) pathologies and dysfunctions (especially spiritual ones) in order to create such a spirituality-centered alternative to the Almighty Dollar. In the words of Saint Seraphim of Sarov ([https://orthodoxwiki.org/Seraphim\\_of\\_Sarov](https://orthodoxwiki.org/Seraphim_of_Sarov)), “*Acquire a peaceful spirit, and around you, thousands will be saved*”. I think that this is a future worthy of fighting for.

This last segment concludes my series on Russia and Islam. I am sorry that I was unable to give some kind of confident and optimistic prediction. My hope is that at the very least I might have contributed to the dispelling of some myths and clichés, an admittedly far more modest goal. For example, if I have succeeded in showing that while Russia and France both struggle with seemingly similar problems (immigration, extremism, crime, separatism, etc.) they are doing so in very different contexts and one should not think of Russia as some kind of “bigger France in the East”. Muslims, in particular, should refrain from transposing Western realities to a fundamentally non-Western context.

Take a look at this interesting flag seen floating near the Syrian city of Palmyra. It shows the Iranian, Syrian, Iraqi and Russian flags combined and the Hezbollah flag in the center. Source: <http://colonelcassad.livejournal.com/3534452.html>



## Russia's "Civilizational Choice"

September 25, 2015

This week, Vladimir Putin and a large number of national and foreign dignitaries and guests have inaugurated the biggest mosque in Europe: the new Moscow Cathedral Mosque.

(<http://thesaker.is/moscow-inaugurates-the-biggest-mosque-in-europe/>)

This was a big event, much awaited by the many tens of thousands of Russian Muslims who live in the Russian capital and who, in the past, have had to pray in the streets due to the lack of a mosque big enough to accommodate them all. This event, however, has a significance which much exceeds just the local lack of space. The truth is that most Muslims who prayed in the Moscow city center wanted more than just a bigger building – they wanted an official acknowledgment of their existence and of their importance for Russia. Now, this much-awaited acknowledgment has finally happened and the famous Moscow city center will feature 240-foot tall golden minarets which will elegantly complement the traditional Orthodox cupolas. But I would argue that this event is even bigger than just a recognition of the role Islam plays in modern Russia – I believe it to be the expression of a profound civilizational choice.

We have heard a lot about “civilizational choices” in the context of the Ukrainian civil war. The Western propaganda machine turned what was a struggle between various Ukrainian oligarchs into a “civilizational choice”, hence the slogan “*Україна це Європа*” (the Ukraine is Europe). What is implied here is that the Ukraine is part of the civilized “West” while Russia is some



kind of “Asiatic” realm, populated by people who neither understand nor like the so-called “European values” and against whom the “civilized” Ukrainians need to stand in defense of Europe. This is just a rehashing of the old Russophobic notion of the Marquis de Custine

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marquis\\_de\\_Custine](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marquis_de_Custine))

who famously said: "*Grattez le Russe, et vous verrez un Tartare*" (scratch the Russian and you will find the Tatar). Hitler also warned about the “Asiatic” nature of the “Russian sub humans”. Paradoxically, while these Russia-haters never understood Russia, they were still on to something very real: the fact that while even though in the recent past (roughly between the 18<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> centuries) Russia was ruled by pro-Western elites, most of the Russian people never surrendered to the acculturation process imposed by their rulers and while they externally complied, internally, on the level of their *ethos*, they kept their ancient roots.

Historically, Russia has been the product of three main factors: Russians take most of their ethnic stock from the ancient Slavic people who lived in what is today called the Ukraine; their religion and worldview from the Orthodox Christianity inherited from the Eastern Roman Empire (mistakenly called "Byzantium" in the West); and their statehood from the Tatar occupation which unified various small principalities into one unified state. True, since Peter I, Russian elites (Monarchists or Communists) tried hard to "westernize" the Russian people, but since the coming to power of Putin, this tendency has finally been reversed. This is why Putin enjoys an 80%+ support in poll after poll while the Russian elites hate him. The events in the Ukraine further accelerated this process: the Ukrainian *pseudo* “civilizational choice” did result in a *real* Russian civilizational choice which has too many implications for full discussion here, but one of these is the embracing of Islam as an integral part of Russia.

In itself, this acceptance of Islam as part of Russia is nothing new. Czar Nicholas II, who was an extremely pious Orthodox Christian and who has been glorified as a saint by the Russian Orthodox Church, personally chose the central location of what was then the biggest mosque in Europe – right in the middle of the then capital of Russia, Saint Petersburg. So what Putin is doing now is just a direct continuation of what was done before him.

Still, less than 20 years after two wars in the Balkans (Bosnia, Kosovo) and two wars inside Russia (both in Chechnia) very few had predicted that Muslim Chechens would fight in defense of Orthodox Christians in the Donbass, and Putin would inaugurate the biggest mosque in Europe just a mile away from the Kremlin. The reality, of course, is that these wars did not pitch Russia against Islam, but Russia against a very specific form of Saudi-backed Wahabi Islam which, itself, was organized and controlled by the AngloZionist Empire.

Most Russians, including Putin himself, are acutely aware of the huge difference between what they call “traditional Islam” and Wahabi/Takfiri Islam and they see the latter as an instrument of the USA to destroy those countries and regimes which refuse to submit to the AngloZionist Empire.

In the West, we mostly hear about how “Islamic terrorists” kill Christians in Syria, Yazidis in Iraq or even Hindus in India. In Russia, however, people regularly hear how Wahabi terrorists murder *Muslim* religious leaders and personalities (especially in southern Russia) and how the Wahabis consider all other Muslims, as infidels and idolaters. In other words, Russians don’t see an “Islamic threat”, but only a “Wahabi/Takfiri” one.

The same goes for history. While in the West we are told that the Crusades opposed “Christendom” and Islam, in Russia the Orthodox Christians fully remember that they were on the same receiving end of the Papist Crusades as the Muslims and many

Russians even remember that the Pope ordered a “Northern Crusade” ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Northern\\_Crusades](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Northern_Crusades)) to destroy Russian Orthodoxy. Finally, even a cursory look at the history of the Ukraine tells Russians everything they need to know about how the Papacy has always persecuted the “Photian schismatics” (Orthodox Christianity) “*ad majorem Dei gloriam*” (for the greater glory of God). In contrast, relations between Orthodox Christians and Muslims have by and large been peaceful. The notable exception to this was the Ottoman Empire which had always viciously persecuted Orthodox Christianity, but that kind of behavior was always an *Ottoman* characteristic, not a Muslim one.

As Colonel-General (3 star general) Vladislav Achalov said ([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vladislav\\_Achalov](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vladislav_Achalov)) “*Православные и Правоверные всегда договорятся!*” (the Orthodox and the Faithful will always find an agreement). He is right. While on a dogmatic level Islam and Orthodoxy are fundamentally incompatible (Islam sees Christ as a man, Orthodoxy as Son of God and God Himself), on a cultural and social level there are no incompatibilities at all. In fact, the two religions share a lot of common views, especially on daily social issues. It is not a coincidence that the same city which now will host the biggest mosque in Europe also banned “gay pride” parades for the next 100 years.

The recent events in the Middle-East are also having their impact on Russia. One can often hear in the Russian media and blogosphere the idea that “the Syrians are killing Wahabis terrorists over there so we don’t have to do that over here” and most people understand that Daesh is not only a problem for the Middle-East but also a direct threat to the Caucasus and Central Asia. Nor are Russian decision makers under any illusions about what can happen in Afghanistan. This is why they have turned the so-called “soft underbelly of Russia” into what I would call the

“armored underbelly of Russia”. (<http://thesaker.is/russia-has-hardened-her-southern-border-politically-and-militarily/>)

Still, while Russian soldiers and special units can kill Wahabis in their thousands, no amount of military force can really eliminate Wahabism itself. Only Islam can truly defeat Wahabism. The perfect example of that reality is Chechnia where the Russians won the war, but Akhmad and Ramzan Kadyrov truly won the peace (even today, Chechen Muslims hold all the primary security functions in Chechnia, while the Federal Forces remain primarily as a reserve force). Russians have no special preference as to which branch of Islam to support against Wahabism, as long as it is a traditional one which does not pose an immediate and major threat to everybody else. In Chechnia most Muslims are Sunni, Iranians and Hezbollah are Shia while the regime in Syria is Alawi. As for the country closest to Russia – Kazakhstan – most of its people are Sunni Muslims. Russia is even exploring, albeit with difficulty, the possibilities of forging closer contacts with Turkey, even though the Ottomans used to be the second worst enemy of Orthodox Christianity (after the Papacy, of course).

The contrast with the AngloZionist Empire could not be greater. While in the West most political leaders choose to deny that the West's current conflict is one pitting the "West" against "Islam", the western propaganda machine (Hollywood, TV, print media, etc.) is clearly demonizing Islam and Muslims in general. Furthermore, the current refugee crisis in Europe is often interpreted as an "Islamic" cultural threat to either secular or "Christian" Europe (pseudo and post-Christian, in reality, of course). French racists chose to blame it all on "Islam" completely overlooking that Christian Romanians and Gypsies could not integrate into French society either.

In the EU politicians are seriously asking whether the *hijab* (<http://arabsinamerica.unc.edu/identity/veiling/hijab/>) is compatible with “western values”. For Orthodox Christians this is a no-brainer: enter into a traditional Orthodox church and you will see all the woman covering their heads with something which looks very much like a *hijab*. Or take a traditional Russian doll – the famous *matryoshkas* – and look at what Russian women used to wear for centuries before the Russian elites tried to westernize them: the very same *hijab*. Finally, look at any Orthodox icon showing the Mother of God and look what she is wearing and, you guessed it, you will see something very similar to a modern *hijab*. In fact, the rules of modesty are almost the same ones in Islam and Orthodox Christianity, as is the preference for men to have beards. What you will never see amongst Orthodox Christians are the Niqabs (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Niqab>) or Burkas (<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Burqa>), not even for monastics.

But that is not a practice amongst Russian Muslims either.

At this point, somebody will inevitably ask about alcohol, so I might as well address that here.

Russians still like their alcohol, especially their beloved vodka, and most will be unwilling to give it up. But most Russians are also acutely aware of the devastating effect the abuse of alcohol has had on the Russian people and society. So, if anything, as long as they are not forced to give up their own right to drink alcohol, they respect those who, like Muslims, decide not to drink it. So while this topic makes for good social conversation, it is really a non-issue since Muslims in Russia have never tried to impose a ban on alcohol on non-Muslims. Again, Tatarstan or Chechnia are not Saudi Arabia (even in Grozny the sale of alcohol is strictly regulated, but it is not banned like in some US “dry counties”).

The inauguration of the new Cathedral Mosque in Moscow is a symbol of a much larger and deeper phenomenon – the slow but steady *rapprochement* between the Orthodox and the Islamic world, it is the expression of a **Russian civilizational choice** which has finally given up any illusion of being part of the "West" and which is turning south (Middle-East), East (Siberia and China) and North (Siberia and the Arctic) and, in doing so, returning to the true historical roots of what I call the "Russian civilizational realm" – those parts of the Eurasian continent which were most affected and influenced by the Russian culture and people.

None of that means that Russia must necessarily be in any way hostile to the West. Of course, as long as the AngloZionists continue to support Nazis in the Ukraine and Takfiris in the Middle-East, while constantly undermining Russia economically and threatening her militarily, relations will remain tense. But most Russians would prefer a friendly and mutually profitable relationship with the EU. The dream of a common house from the Atlantic to the Urals still has a lot of supporters in Russia. The sad reality, however, is that the Europeans seem completely unable to stand up even for their own, pragmatic, national interests. The way the EU shot itself in the foot with sanctions against Russia, or with the fantastically stupid war against Gadafi just proves to the Kremlin that the EU is just a voiceless US colony. I am sure that Russia will be willing to have a friendly partnership with Europe if and when the US-designed EU and NATO are finally replaced with something more European. But until then all the Russians can do is wait and attend to the multiple risks and opportunities presented by the rest of the planet.

Only time will show whether the so-called "West" can finally give up its centuries-old dream to subjugate Russia in one way or another. All Russia can do is to prepare for the worst and hope for the best while opening her capital to the Muslim world while keeping Papal visits and "gay pride" parades away.



# The Fighting Imam of Donbass (MUST SEE!)

October 05, 2015

Dear friends,

This is an exceptionally interesting video which I have asked my brother in arms Tatzhit Mihailovich to subtitle it for you: a Crimean Tatar imam is interviewed by a Russian Orthodox TV channel about his role in the anti-Nazi resistance of the Donbass and about his views on Islam and Russia. Great stuff!

Enjoy and a big THANK YOU to Tatzhit!

*(please make sure to press the “cc” button to see the English captions)*

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dmiMbUz5Qos>





## **Ramzan Kadyrov Offers Putin His Own \*Personal\* Volunteer Chechen Special Force**

Amazing video! (see below) Thanks so much to all those who translated it in less than 24 hours!! The video begins by showing the Chechen Special Forces equipped with Russian military and police Special Forces uniforms. Notice that the average age seems to be in the 30s. You can tell that these are hardcore, experienced fighters. Will Putin actually use them and, if yes, how so? It is hard to tell. Probably not officially, but it is obvious to me that these are ideal forces to send anywhere where "plausible deniability" is needed or to operate in a Muslim society (Lebanon? Xinjiang? Syria?). What is certain is that they are already present in Novorussia.

If the AngloZionists try to restart a Wahabi insurgency in the Caucasus (or in Central Asia), these men will be the first on the front lines and they will show zero mercy to any captured Wahabi. In all likelihood, just their presence will make the Wahabis run for their lives (like the Georgians did in 2008 as soon as they heard that the Chechen special battalion "Vostok" was approaching).

I would note that having Muslim elite "crack" Special Forces is nothing new in Russia. This was the case in Imperial Russia and in the Soviet Union, both of which had elite Muslim half-squadrons and battalions. What we see today is just the rebirth of an Old Russian tradition which will further horrify and outrage the Empire. Does anybody still doubt that Russia is not Europe?

And just to clarify: you will hear a reporter asking Ramzan Kadyrov whether all these men had submitted their "resignation in writing". What this means is that all the men who were already

serving in an official capacity (military or police) have resigned their commission to become "only volunteers" i.e., people willing to execute any mission given to them by Putin but whose presence or actions could not implicate the official Russian (or Chechen) armed or police forces. These are *volunteers* who *voluntarily* will execute any mission given to them, worldwide, *personally*, by Putin. Again, does anybody still doubt that Russia is not Europe :-)

### **The video:**

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Irlj\\_4IVLBP8](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Irlj_4IVLBP8)

### **Transcript of Kadyrov's words:**

For many years with arms in our hands, we fought against international terrorism and defeated it. But the threat of terrorism in Russia has not yet disappeared. I am sure that you are not indifferent to the fate of our Fatherland. We remember the days when enemies surrounded Chechnya from all sides, but there was not a single friend who was ready to stand up for the Chechen people. This role was assumed not by a soldier, not by a politician, not by a general. The mufti and the religious leader of Chechnya Akhmad Haji Kadyrov (*the late father of Ramzan Kadyrov, murdered by Wahabis in a terrorist attack – the Saker*) stood up to protect the people and the integrity of Russia. He had no army, no weapons, and no money; but he had the Holy Quran in his hands. A formidable weapon for him was courage, fairness, and faith in his rightness. You could say the whole world was against Akhmad Haji. Vladimir Putin was the first who believed him, supported him and held out a hand of friendship and assistance. It was not

easy to do. The Russian President had to prove to the politicians, the military, and all the people, that only Akhmad Haji would reassemble the torn apart Chechen people, restore peace and stability and deal with the international terrorism trying to destroy the country. In the most difficult moments, when there were no solutions to the complex problems; when the question arose for our people to be or not to be; Ahmad Haji appealed to Vladimir Putin and not a single time was he refused – I saw it with my own eyes.

On May 1, 2004, speaking in front of the most famous people, Akhmad Haji said that the time had come when each of us must make his particular choice. Today I repeat the words of Akhmad Haji – it's time to make an informed choice. And we say to the entire world that we are the combat infantry of Vladimir Putin. If we receive an order, we will actually prove that this is so. For fifteen years Putin has been helping our people. Now, you and I – and we have tens of thousands of people, specially trained – ***ask the national leader of Russia to consider us a special voluntary unit of the Commander in Chief, ready to defend Russia and the stability of her borders or accomplish a combat mission of any complexity.*** We fully realize that our country has a regular army, air force, navy and nuclear forces. However, there are tasks that can be solved only by volunteers, and we'll solve them.

America and Europe have declared an economic war on Russia. They are trying to cause chaos in the country - panic and riots. But the Russian people have united around their leader – Vladimir Putin. The Chechen people take one of the central places in this unity. We have chosen the path of Akhmad Haji. He firmly stood on the way of the Messenger of Allah, *sallallahu alayhi wasallam* (peace be upon him). Haji Ahmad said that he is ready to submit. If there is a person who can prove that he made even a single step that goes against the Quran or the Sunna, *sallallahu*

*alayhi wasallam* (peace be upon him). Such a person has not yet been found. Therefore, I firmly believe that you and I are on the path of Allah and His Messenger, *sallallahu alayhi wasallam* (peace be upon him). We will never deviate from this path. Starting today, each of us must be ready at any moment to prove their dedication to the cause of our lives. We will meet Russia's enemy wherever he may be, in its own lair. We publicly declare this to the whole world, so that it is clear and understandable to everyone – Long live our great motherland Russia! Long live our national leader of Russia Vladimir Putin! *Allahu Akbar* (God is the greatest)!



# **A Muslim Police Officer Dies a Hero's Death and Receives Russia's Highest Honorary Title "Hero of Russia"**

The video below is an excerpt of a recent one-hour long tribute on Russia TV to a 30-year-old officer of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Magomed Nurbagandov. Here is a summary of what happened: Magomed (Mohamed/Muhammad in Russian) was camping with a friend in a forest when recruiters for ISIS/Daesh stumbled upon them. They woke them up, beat them a little and searched them. When they found Magomed's picture ID as a police junior lieutenant, they asked him if that was him. He answered that yes, it was. They told him to appeal to his fellow officers to resign from their jobs (it was understood that this was the only way to save his life). He refused and said "[continue to] work, brothers". Irritated, one of the Takfiris then said "he is courageous because he is drunk" and murdered him (he was not drunk, he had just been sleeping all night; also, accusing a fellow Muslim of drinking was, of course, meant as an insult). They then released the video on a Takfiri website cutting away the part where Magomed defiantly not only refused to obey but told his fellow officers to continue the fight against terrorism (in this context, the Russian word "to work" is a slang expression for "fighting the enemy"). Later the terrorists were shot and captured and the video found by the Russian anti-terrorist teams. That is how Magomed's heroism became public. This excerpt shows what this feat meant for the people of Dagestan, all Russians, and Vladimir Putin. Enjoy!

**The video:**

<https://www.4shared.com/video/dj57pN9ece/cut.html>



# **The Essential Saker: Book II, Section III**

## **Charlie Hebdo**

January 08, 2015

### **I am NOT Charlie**

Okay, let's be clear. I am not Muslim. I oppose terrorism. I don't even support the death penalty. I loathe Takfirism. I oppose violence as a means to make a political or ethical point. I fully support freedom of speech, including critical speech and humor.

But this morning I am most definitely NOT Charlie.

In fact, I am disgusted and nauseated by the sick display of collective hypocrisy around the murders in France. Here is why:

### **Charlie Hebdo for the Darwin Awards**

The folks at Charlie Hebdo had it coming. Here is what I wrote about them in September 2012 when they published their famous caricatures of the Prophet Mohammed: Worthy of the Darwin Awards, ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Darwin\\_Awards](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Darwin_Awards)) if you ask me. Excellent; the "gene pool" of the French "caviar-Left" badly needs some cleaning. Today I fully stand by my words.

Let me ask you this: what would be the point of, say, taking a nap on train tracks? You don't have to "agree" with the train which will run you over, but it still will, won't it? What about taking a nap on train tracks specifically to make a point? To prove that the train is bad? To dare it? To make fun of it? Would that not be the height of stupidity? And yet, that is \*exactly\* what Charlie Hebdo did. I would even argue that was how Charlie Hebdo made its money, daring the "Muslim train" to run them over. You think I am exaggerating? Check out the caricature which one of the folks who got murdered yesterday had just

posted. The text reads: *“Still no terrorist attacks in France – Wait, we have until the end of January to send you our best wishes“*. The crazy person shown in the drawing is packing a Kalashnikov and wearing an Afghan “Pakol” (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pakol>) – the typical “crazy Muslim” in Charlie Hebdo’s world. Talk about a stupid dare...

### **“Spitting in people’s souls”**

There is an expression in Russian: spitting in somebody’s soul. It fully applies here. Muslims worldwide have been unambiguously clear about that. They take blasphemy very, very seriously, as they do the name of the Prophet and the Quran. If you want to really offend a Muslim, ridicule his Prophet or his Holy Book. That is not a secret at all. And when Charlie Hebdo published their caricatures of the Prophet and when they ridiculed him in a deliberately rude and provocative manner, they knew what they were doing: they were very deliberately deeply offending **1.6 billion** Muslims worldwide. Oh, and did I mention that in Islam blasphemy is a crime punishable by death? Well, it turns out that of **1.6 billion** Muslims **exactly three** decided to take justice into their own hands and kill the very deliberately blaspheming Frenchmen. You don’t have to be Muslim or to approve of the death penalty for blasphemy to realize that this was inevitable and that this has nothing to do with Islam as a religion. Offend any group as large as 1.6 billion and sooner or later you will find 1-5 folks willing to use violence to make you pay for it. This is a statistical inevitability.

Are some victims more equal than others?

So 12 deliberately "soul spitting blasphemers" were murdered and all of France is in deep mourning. The media worldwide does such a good job presenting it all as a planetary disaster that many



thousands of people worldwide say "I am Charlie", sob, light candles and take a "courageous" stance for freedom of speech.

Crocodile tears if you ask me.

The fact is that the AngloZionists have carefully and lovingly nurtured, organized, armed, financed, trained, equipped and even directed the Takfiri crazies for decades. From the war in Afghanistan to Syria today these murderous psychopaths have been the foot-soldiers of the AngloZionist Empire for years. But, apparently, nobody cares about their victims in Afghanistan, in Bosnia, in Chechnia, in Kosovo, in Libya, in Kurdistan, in Iraq or elsewhere. There, these liver-eating murderers are "freedom fighters" who get full support, including from the very same media which today is in mourning over Charlie Hebdo. Apparently, in the western *ethos*, some victims are more equal than others.

And when was the last time somebody in Europe shed a single tear over the daily murders of innocent people in the Donbass whose murder is paid for and directed by the western regimes?

How stupid do they think we are?

And then this. Even a drooling idiot knew that Charlie Hebdo was THE prime target for that kind of attack. And I promise you that French cops are not drooling idiots. Yet, for some reason, they were nowhere to be seen that day. Only a van with two (or one?) cop was parked nearby (hardly an anti-terrorist protection detail) and one poor cop was shot and then executed with an AK shot to the head while he was begging for mercy. Is this the best the French state can do?

Hardly.

So what is going on here? I will tell you what – the EU 1%ers are now capitalizing on these murders to crack down on their own population. Sarkozy already met Hollande and they both agreed that new levels of firmness and vigilance need to be implemented.

(<http://www.franceinfo.fr/actu/politique/article/sarkozy-demande-hollande-d-augmenter-le-niveau-de-fermete-et-de-vigilance-628421>) Does that not reek of a French 9/11?

So no, I am most definitely NOT Charlie this morning and I am disgusted beyond words with the obscene display of *doubleplusgoodthinking* “solidarity” for a group of “caviar-lefties” who made their money spitting in the souls of billions of people and then dared them to do something about it. And I am under no illusion whatsoever about the fact that *cui bono* clearly indicates that the French regime either organized it all, or let it happen or, at the very least, made maximal political use of it all.

But most of all, I am disgusted with all those who play along and studiously avoid asking the right questions about all this. I guess they really are “Charlies” all of them.

I am not.



# In the Charlie Hebdo Psyop Double Standards, Logical Fallacies and Crass Ignorance are Everywhere

January 18, 2015

Many of you pointed out that apparently the French and most westerners seem to be much more upset when 12 people die in Paris than when hundreds, thousand and tens of thousands die elsewhere. It appears that the 1980s slogan "don't touch my pal" ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SOS\\_Racisme](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/SOS_Racisme)) which was originally supposed to denounce racism now has been "re-worked" into a, if not racist, then at least a chauvinist mode: don't kill French leftists no matter how offensive their discourse is. I won't make that case again here, but because by now anybody still capable of critical thought "got it", but I will look at another, much less noticed case of double standards: the one about the issue of moral pain.

Here is what the official *doxa* tells us: Muslims have no right to whine about their Prophet being insulted, this is part of free speech. It is disingenuous for them to claim that they have been hurt by these caricatures. In reality, they have not been hurt; they just had their feathers ruffled by a bit of disrespectful speech. How can you possibly compare such ruffled feathers with issues of life and death?

So is there such thing as moral pain and can it be compared to physical pain?

Let's look at the record as it stands in the West:

Any psychologist will explain to you that not only does moral pain exist, but it can be worse than physical pain. This is why some people confess to crimes (whether real or not) when they are told that their family members will be tortured next, even though they

themselves had found the internal courage not to yield to torture inflicted upon them. An idea can hurt more than physical pain.

The Geneva Conventions specifically forbid mock executions even though all they inflict is fear (a form of moral pain).

In France, it is currently illegal to even question the official version of the so-called "Holocaust" precisely because doing so would cause moral pain to the very few actual "Holocaust survivors" still alive. This protection from moral pain even extends to the relatives and descendants of "Holocaust survivors" who were born after the war and who never suffered from any ill-treatment themselves.

At the famous Nuremberg trial, Julius Streicher ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Julius\\_Streicher](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Julius_Streicher)) was sentenced to death even though he never committed any other crime than "infecting the German mind with the virus of anti-Semitism". He was, by the way, also viciously tortured before his execution.

(<https://archive.org/details/TheTortureOfJuliusStreicherinHisOwnWordsAtNuremberg-April46>)  
His crime? He was the founder and editor of a newspaper, Der Stürmer, ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Der\\_Sturmer](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Der_Sturmer)) a nasty racist propaganda paper whose name can be roughly translated as "The Attacked" or "The Stormer". Apparently, hate speech can even get you the death penalty in the West.

The 8th Amendment of the US Constitution ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eighth\\_Amendment\\_to\\_the\\_United\\_States\\_Constitution](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eighth_Amendment_to_the_United_States_Constitution)) prohibits "cruel and unusual punishment"; especially if it is "degrading to human dignity". Apparently, for the Founding Fathers, human dignity was an extremely valuable and real thing which deserved to be protected.

Even in GITMO (hardly a bastion of civilization and human rights!) following the 2005 scandals about the desecration of the Quran,

([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2005\\_Quran\\_desecration\\_controversy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2005_Quran_desecration_controversy))

it was decided that the rules about the manipulation of the Quran (which had already existed in the past)

(<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2005/05/16/AR2005051601320.html>) would be strictly implemented. So even in waterboarding GITMO insulting the Prophet is considered beyond the norms of civilized behavior. Apparently not in Paris.

What about the law defending against slander? Are they not here to protect people from the pain resulting from somebody else's speech? Do we not care if somebody dear to us is insulted or ridiculed?

So who are we kidding here? Do I need to bring further examples to make my point? **Everybody in the West already knows that caricatures like the one published by Charlie Hebdo really do bring on real pain to Muslims.** We are not talking about ruffled feathers or irritation; we are talking about real moral and psychological distress here; the kind which normal western civilizational and legal norms try to protect people from.

The truth which others dare not speak but which I will spell out for you here is simple: Western elites have the same attitude towards Muslims as Victoria Nuland has for the EU: f\*\*k them! That is the real message that not only Charlie Hebdo but the entire teary circus around the Paris massacre sends to Muslims worldwide: **bleep you, your religion and your Prophet, bleep you and your victims – thousands and even millions of your dead Muslims (Iraq anybody?!) are not worth 12 of our guys, and we get to limit your speech, but don't you dare limit ours!**

And if a Muslim dares to object, he is instantly reminded about “his” stonings, burkas, terrorist attacks, etc. with the inevitable punch line: Islam is in no position to give lessons to the civilized West. Sadly, Islam is vulnerable to such attack because of its support for the death penalty and its use of various frankly inhuman execution methods. But that is far from being the full picture.

First, until recently, the West ALSO had plenty of execution methods which are infinitely worse than those legal in Islam (anybody doubting this better read the Wikipedia entry under Robert-Francois Damiens ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert-Francois\\_Damiens](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert-Francois_Damiens)) or remember that the French abolished the guillotine only in 1981 and against the popular will). Second, at least Islam is honest about its punishments. Compare that with the USA where people are officially sentenced to prison terms like in other civilized countries, but where it is well known, understood and accepted that your chances of being brutally assaulted or anally raped are very high, especially if you are weak, and where people are held in supermax isolation units which the UN correctly defines as torture.

Second, it is artificial to compare two (or more) civilizations by only comparing their penal codes. Why not compare other forms of violence such as warfare or genocides. Here, even the worst of the worst Muslims (the Ottomans) compare very favorably with the Europeans. I am sorry if I offend the latter, but that is a fact. Though of course, there have been plenty of examples of Muslim atrocities (by the Ottomans and the Persians in particular). But compared to what the West did to entire continents (African, North and South America) these are truly minor incidents. Of course, folks in the West are not too knowledgeable about all this, and the comforting narrative is that Europe was civilized, an heir to the Greek and Roman civilizations

(a lie – post Frankish Europe re-discovered antiquity thanks to Muslims and Jews!) whereas the Muslims are just goat herders from the deserts of the Arabian Peninsula. Comforting narrative for sure, but factually wrong. Muslims, however, are very much aware of this history and don't like to be looked down by the very Westerners which they see as rather brutish and always bloodthirsty.

Third, there is a feature of modern western civilization which does set it apart from pretty much all others. The quasi-total absence of the sacred. For a modern, secular and educated person in the West, there is very little which is truly sacred. In the past, wives and mothers still used to be sacred, and telling an Italian or Spaniard “cornuto” or “hijo de puta” could get you knifed. Nowadays a French rap group proudly calls itself “Nique Ta Mère” (f\*\*k your mother) ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Supreme\\_NTM](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Supreme_NTM)). Some will say this is progress, I suppose. In the USA, the flag is sacred. At least to some. And, apparently, for millions of people in France – free speech, including deliberately offending free speech, is sacred. Except when it is directed at Jews, in which case it can land you in jail. For most Muslims, the prophet is so sacred that every time they mention His name they add “*sallallahu alayhi wasallam*” (peace be upon him). Now, you don't have to be a Muslim yourself or to approve of the Prophet to be capable of understanding that the Prophet Mohammed is truly dear and even sacred to Muslims. The fact that there is nothing sacred left in the West does not mean that the rest of the world has slouched down to a similar degree of degeneracy or that those who hold nothing sacred have a license to impose their lack of anything sacred or their indifference on everybody else and offend them to their (sick) heart's content.

The most disgusting kind of westerner is the kind that actually takes pride in offending the feelings of those who still do have

things which are sacred to them. This is what Charlie Hebdo was all about. Theirs was not a “discourse”; it was an endless quest to become the most offensive, vulgar and crude newspaper in Europe. And, by the way, before the latest Charlie Hebdo psyop, this disgusting and stupid paper printed 60,000 copies for a country of 66,000,000 people. But then, apparently, some French matter more than others (what else is new?). Double standards again.

When considering any aspects of the Charlie Hebdo psyop, you will inevitably find that double standards and logical fallacies are everywhere; that some speech is freer than others, that some victims matter more than others, that some atrocities are more atrocious than others, and that some pain gets more respect than others. But the worst for me is this sickening solidarity with those who made insulting others into some kind of noble feat; these "heroes" are lionized for their "courage" to generate real moral pain in others. I see nothing noble in that at all and the fact that they were brutally and viciously murdered by, apparently, a gang of Takfiri freaks does not make them, in any way, more respectable.

One more thing: some of you have expressed outrage at the fact that Sheikh Imran Hosein said that the biggest evil the world has ever seen will rule from Jerusalem. Clearly, the good Sheikh is a vicious anti-Semite, right?

(Sigh)

I wish that those who speak about the "Christian West" actually knew a little something about Christianity, especially of Christian eschatology. What the Sheikh was saying is in no way different from what the Church Fathers said, including that the Antichrist would rule the world from Jerusalem. A 5 min. search on the Internet gave me these pretty decent sources:



biblelight.net/... <http://biblelight.net/fathers-on-antichrist.htm>  
unitypublishing.com/...  
<http://www.unitypublishing.com/prophecy/AntichristbySaints.htm>  
earlychristianwritings.com/...  
<http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/hippolytus-christ.html>

Islamic eschatology is, by the way, remarkably similar to the traditional Christian one. A quick search under the term “Dajjal” ([http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Masih\\_ad-Dajjal](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Masih_ad-Dajjal)) yielded these sources:

islaam.org/... [http://www.islaam.org/al\\_mahdi/dajjaal.htm](http://www.islaam.org/al_mahdi/dajjaal.htm)  
islamqa.info/... <http://islamqa.info/en/8806>  
youtube.com/...  
<https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL60F84B368D3270FF>

As for Sheikh Imran Hosein’s advice to the Muslims of France to leave while they can, it is fully in line with this admonition of Christ Himself who told his apostles

*“And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city.”*  
(Matt 10:14-15).

One does not have to agree with what the Sheikh says, but that is hardly a reason to call him crazy or anti-Semitic.

Frankly, what I see taking place is mostly **a lashing out against Islam and against Muslims which is first and foremost based on crass ignorance**. I personally am not a Muslim and I vehemently disagree with some teachings and practices of Islam. And I am on

record saying that I fully support what I call "Putin's ultimatum" to the Takfiri freaks: stop or we will exterminate you. And, when needed, Putin did exactly that: since 2000, Russia has literally executed every single leader of the Chechen insurgency; every single one. Some were killed in Russia, others in Chechnia, others even elsewhere, but they are all dead. And the Wahabi "Icherkian" insurgency has been literally exterminated too. Not only that, but Putin has fully backed Assad, the other man who has not hesitated to physically exterminate as many Takfiri freaks as possible (and Assad did such a good job of it that they had to retreat to Iraq). And I am on record supporting Assad too. And, finally, I have always fully supported Hezbollah and Sheikh Hassan Nasrallah; not only in their war of national liberation against Israel but also in their struggle against the so-called "Syrian opposition" (where the freaks who murdered the Charlie Hebdo people came from!). I don't think that anybody even minimally honest can accuse me of having any sympathies for the Takfiri/Wahabi terrorists or for their actions in Paris.

But to those of you who take issue with my statement that the "West" cannot win against the Muslim world, I say this: take the example of Russia and realize that **the Russians can kill Wahabis, but they cannot kill Wahabism. It took a Muslim man like Akhmad Kadyrov and his son to defeat the Wahabi ideology in Chechnia.** The same goes for the West: no matter how many ISIS or al-Qaeda terrorists the western security services kill (or, pretend to kill!), the ideology of Takfirism will only be defeated by other Muslims (who, by the way, are always the first and main victims of the Takfiri freaks!).

Just take one look at Hollande, Merkel or Obama and tell me that they have anything at all to say other than vapid platitudes and insipid lies? Do you really believe that they have anything to oppose the ideas of Osama bin-Laden, Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi or

even Muhammad ibn Abd al-Wahhab or Taqi ad-Din Ahmad ibn Taymiyyah?

Methinks that the western leaders are both too arrogant and too ignorant to face this reality and that they think that they can outsmart the devil on their own – hence they unleash the Takfiri demon against the Muslim world and the Nazi demon against the Donbass. I say that with leaders like that, the West has exactly \*zero\* chance to prevail. And considering that, with each passing year the Western leaders become even dumber, more arrogant, more pathetic and more clueless, I see no reason to believe that the West will win the "clash of civilizations" it has itself created.

Now please don't shoot the messenger.



# In Search of Russia – Guns & Butter

## Interview

April 26, 2017

This is Guns and Butter.

*You look at all the leaders, from Peter the Great to Yeltsin, all of them – all of them – were constantly thinking about the West and what the West does and Europe, Europe, Europe, Europe, Europe. That was the big thing. The important direction was westward. The people around Putin think very differently. They see the south, they see the east including Siberia, and they even see the north, the Arctic Circle, which they think is extremely important. So they want to turn, shift Russia away towards another civilizational model, and they also believe that the Russian values should be different from the ones that the West advocates. So it's a desire for a uniqueness, of fully fostering a distinct, separate Russian civilizational realm.*

**Bonnie Faulkner:** I'm Bonnie Faulkner. Today on Guns and Butter, Andrei Raevsky, who blogs as "the Saker". Today's show: "In Search of Russia." The Saker was born in a military family of white Russian refugees in western Europe where he lived most of his life. After completing two college degrees in the United States, he returned to Europe where he worked as a military analyst until he lost his career, due to his vocal opposition to the Western-sponsored wars in Chechnya, Croatia, Bosnia and Kosovo. After re-training as a software engineer, he returned to the United States where he now lives with his family. He has been blogging since 2007 as "the Saker", and his analytical essays are now widely distributed on the Internet. He is the author of [The Essential Saker: From the Trenches of the Emerging Multipolar World](#). Today we discuss the uniqueness of Russia, both its historical differences

and similarities with the West, 300 years of Western domination, the Soviet period, the wars in Chechnya, Russian military defenses and Atlantic Integration versus Eurasian Sovereignty.

Saker, welcome to the show again.

**The Saker:** Thank you so much. It's a pleasure.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** In your article, "Searching for Russia," you write that "Russia is different in a profound and unique way". Being an heir to the eastern Roman Empire, also known as Byzantium, Russian roots are in antiquity, as opposed to the West, whose roots, according to you, "are in the Middle Ages." Could you explain this history?

**The Saker:** We're talking about practically a millennium and more even, but I'll try to make it simple and short. Basically, first of all, Rome in the Western civilization and consciousness we are taught that Rome was sacked in 410 AD, and the Western Roman Empire in was sacked 476; and after that began the Middle Ages.

Well, for Russia that sequence doesn't work at all because what happened was that the Roman Empire was separated in two parts, an eastern and a western one, and in the West we're told there's a Byzantine Empire. But if you look closer at it, there never was such a thing as a Byzantine Empire; there was simply a Roman Empire that continued to exist. The very same Roman Empire, not a different entity, continued to exist in the East and existed until the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

In other words, the first thing to realize is that the Roman Empire did not end in the 5<sup>th</sup> century. It survived for a full 1,000 years. So while Europe was undergoing the Dark Ages, or the Middle Ages, Rome continued to exist. That Rome played a crucial role in Russian history and culture. I would say the arrival of Roman Christianity is what really created the Russian nation. I don't mean that in an ethnical sense; I mean that in a cultural sense.

At the end of the 10<sup>th</sup> century a Russian ruler named Vladimir accepted to become a Christian. He became an Orthodox Christian, an Eastern Christian, and Rome basically infused Russia with its religious tradition. That tradition was passed on to Russia, and if we call Rome antiquity, because there never were Any Middle ages, properly speaking, in Russia, there was also no Renaissance, which is, if you want, the emergence from the Middle Ages.

So what we have is a country that was founded by the infusion of Roman civilization into it, that never had any Middle Ages or a Renaissance, and that went basically from antiquities; you could argue; straight into modernity. The fact is that the process, which was so strong and important for Western history, which is the Middle Age and the Renaissance, simply never happened in Russia.

To strengthen that differentiation, another thing happened. To the degree that the Roman civilization played a key role in the founding of Russia, the culture, the founding of Russia as a state is also due to a process which the West didn't know, which is the invasion coming from the East of the Tatar Mongol Empire who occupied Russia and who stayed there for 250 years. Basically, that is what united different Russian princes into one state and I would say that the Russian state, in terms of its policy, military tactics, etc., was a product of the Tatar Mongol Empire. So we have Roman origins, spiritually, and Tatar Mongol origins in a political sense. That's dramatically different from what the history of the Western Europeans was during the same time period.

So while Russians externally look European because they're mostly white; i.e. they don't have a different skin color; I would argue that they're extremely different culturally.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** That's very interesting. I was just about to ask you how significant was the Asian Tatar Mongol invasion in the creation of the modern Russian state. I guess you're saying that

it was quite significant.

**The Saker:** It was extremely significant. First of all, ancient Russia lost about half of its population. It was a very brutal period for Russia, and the original cities of ancient Russia – for instance, the best known is Kiev – suffered tremendously, and new cities appeared that were capable of resisting that. They learned from their occupiers and then eventually kicked them out. The Tatars forced the political model upon the Russian nation to make it possible for that nation to resist and eventually prevail, which is what happened.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** You write that, “The brand of Christianity received by Russia was the Roman, not the Frankish one.” What is the difference? What is the Frankish one?

**The Saker:** This is what in the West would be called Roman Catholicism or Western Christianity or Latin Christianity, and this is the key to understand why there were so many wars between – well, actually, I shouldn’t say wars between Russia and the West, but I should say why there were so many attempts by the West to subdue and conquer Russia. Russia, practically from its foundation, was in opposition to the West in terms of its values, civilization output, and ethos. Russians never were truly part of the Western culture.

Now, I know some people are going to be shocked when I say that because they’re going to say, “What are you talking about? What about Tchaikovsky, what about Dostoevsky, what about so many – how shall I put it – representatives of the Russian culture that played such a big role and who were very much influenced by the West?” If you look at the architecture of St Petersburg and the penetration of Masonic ideas in the Russian aristocracy, that is all true. There was a profound interpenetration between the West and Russia, but that interpenetration affected primarily the elites, the aristocracy, and the courts. So that was a reality at the top; not at all

for the bulk of the Russian nation. 90% of the Russians were not involved in that process at all.

So that also creates an interesting dynamic; an alienation; and a profound alienation of the masses versus their elites. It took a dramatic turn during the 17<sup>th</sup> century on an internal Orthodox dispute. I don't want to go into complicated dogmatic issues here, but I would just say that the people had one outlook on Orthodoxy and most of the elites another one, although I'm simplifying that. Some of the elites were on the other side, etc.

There was basically a schism, a chasm, a breaking open and gradually getting bigger and bigger and bigger between the rulers of Russia, starting particularly with Peter the First, in the early 18<sup>th</sup>/late 17<sup>th</sup> century, up to the Revolution. So there were tensions vertically in Russia, and tensions East versus West.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** You have started to explain this, but how have the Russian ruling elites differed from the Russian people, particularly in the last 300 years?

**The Saker:** A couple of things happened at the same time. Peter the First wanted to change the face of Russia, as he would have put it, and his supporters do, to modernize it and open it to the West. I would simply say Westernize. Why not use that term?

A lot of the old elites had, at that moment, moved away. The old aristocracy, the old nobility, had moved away from the centers of power. He created a much more recent, new aristocracy and ruling class. At the same time, he introduced a number of reforms that profoundly alienated the people in their culture and their religious feelings and the way society should work. Things which can look funny when we speak nowadays; for instance, having beards. For Orthodox Christians it's very important for men to have a beard because that is how you're supposed to uphold the image and the likeness to God; the way you were created. Well, Peter the Great said it's a barbaric thing; that wisdom is not in the



beard but in the brain; and he forced all the people to shave their beards. For the Russians of that period that was very traumatic and very insulting and it manifested itself in that kind of things.

Secondly, of course, there is the fact that serfdom was also something that profoundly alienated many Russian people. So there was event after event after event that gradually alienated more and more the masses from the elites.

I would add something paradoxical here. A lot of tsars perceived that, and wanted to defend, and had the sensitivity to try to represent or cater to or be concerned for what the masses wanted, and that created yet another problem: the opposition between the monarchs and the aristocrats, which is very much overlooked in Western historiography. There's always an assumption that there's the monarch and the courts and the aristocracy and they're all together. It's absolutely not true. In Russian history, the principles of aristocracy and monarchy were opposed to each other, and a lot of monarchs were killed because of that. So yet again, this schism in Russian culture in the Russian nation created yet another tension now among the elites. So it's a multi-layered cake of contradictions which eventually exploded; truly dramatically in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** What was the point you were making about serfdom alienating the masses?

**The Saker:** For instance, generally, feudalism was an import from the West. Russians are and have been in history very freedom loving, and bordering on anarchists and the views were very strong. Self-determination, autonomy, local rule, self-rule; there were very, very numerous examples of self-rule by cities or by groups of people. That's, for instance, how the Cossacks had it - the famous Cossacks were very highly autonomous in their culture and very jealous of that freedom.

So when the center tried to impose feudalism and serfdom on

the Russian people, a lot of Russians fled. They fled to the borderlands where it was safer; you were further away from the central powers. Others went to Siberia.

The same thing, when I mentioned that schism inside the Orthodox Church. To make it very simple, there was an old right and a new right. I'm not going to go into details of what separated the two. A lot of the old ritualists actually emigrated from Russia. They went to all sorts of countries. Some went to Turkey, some went eventually even to the United States; and even South America still has nowadays different groups who fled that authoritarian central power in Russia.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** You write that: "There is no way to consider the Soviet period as a continuation of the pre-1917 Russia." Do you consider the Russian revolutions of 1917 as a complete break with historical Russia?

**The Saker:** Yes, but I have to say first of all, there are two revolutions in 1917. There is a first break. In February of 1917 there was a coup organized by the elites against the Tsar; and then in October, or November by the old calendar, there is yet another revolution where the Bolsheviks seized power from the democrats.

So the Bolsheviks, counter to what most people think, never overthrew the Tsar. They overthrew the Masonic government of a gentleman named Kerensky who was representing what we today would call the oligarchy or the globalists. Oligarchs are what they were, really, very wealthy, rich people. Remember that I told you that the elites after Peter had a different agenda than the Tsars, and that was typical. So the first oligarchy overthrew the tsar and then the Bolsheviks overthrew the oligarchs.

Yes, it is a break, though it has certain common features with traditional Russia. It's impossible to completely say that there is no continuity. After all, it's the same cities, the same language, and the same people that were involved. But on a philosophical level I

would compare that difference – the image that I’ve always used is a healthy tissue versus a malignant tumor. A tumor shares a lot of the DNA with the tissue that it came from, yet it has crucial differences, and these crucial differences are sufficient in many cases to actually kill the host that is suffering from that condition, and that’s what Communism and the Soviet period was for Russia. It was an anti-Russia, but with a certain degree of commonality on the DNA, definitely; for instance, the values of community, of collectivism, of fairness. All these ideas are very much rooted in Russian culture.

So the communists were not stupid and they didn’t only come up with things that would shock Russians. They said, we’ll give the land back to the people, give back freedom, abolish inequalities. All these things speak profoundly to the Russian culture but it comes in an atheist mold, for instance. The virulent atheism of the Bolsheviks was something that profoundly shocked Russia, which traditionally was a very religious and pious society.

Secondly, a lot of the early generation of Bolsheviks were ethnic Jews and, careful here – there’s also a mistake that people make. The fact that a majority of Bolsheviks were Jews does not mean the majority of Jews were Bolsheviks. A majority of pre-revolutionary Russian Jews were not Bolsheviks; they were usually socialists, Mensheviks, Bundists and all sorts of different parties. But, it is true, and even Putin recently confirmed that speaking in front of a group of Orthodox rabbis in Moscow. He said about 80 to 85% of the first-generation Bolsheviks were Jews. That’s factually true, and these people were extremely Russophobic. They hated the Russian culture, which they saw as anti-Semitic and they hated Christianity, and Orthodoxy was a very traditional form of Christianity.

So even though most traditional anti-Semitism and hatred of Jews is something you saw more often in what is today the

Ukraine, which is southern-western Russia, when the Bolsheviks seized power they truly opened the persecution. I would say that I think there was an attempt to really, truly commit a cultural genocide of Russia by these people. So when you have that happen, you can't say that this was just a continuity of the same old regime under a new heading or wrapping.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** Do you believe that the 1917 revolution – that is, the second one, the communist revolution – was not inherently Russian but imported from the West?

**The Saker:** Oh, yeah. There's absolutely no doubt about that. Trotsky was an agent of the United States. Lenin had contacts with the Germans. It was definitely an import.

What happened was that basically once the oligarchs or the liberals or the democrats, if you want to call them, took power, the country went into such a degree of chaos that I would compare that to somebody who has a severe immune deficiency. And it wasn't that hard to infect it with something. The most organized – I would say the intellectually superior group, actually, were definitely the Bolsheviks. If you look at the writings of Lenin or Trotsky, these guys were smart; they had a vision; they had a plan; they had a global explanation of what's happening in history. When I compare them to the infinite mediocrity of the non-entities who took power early that year, the democrats, it's no surprise that they lost power eight months after seizing it. They were just good enough to destroy the empire. That's all they could do. They couldn't build or fix anything.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** You write that: "In a cultural and spiritual sense, the Russian nation was oppressed, to various degrees, roughly between 1666 and 1999. That is 330 years, a long period by any standards." How would you characterize this oppression?

**The Saker:** I would say, first of all, that you shouldn't take those dates as an instant binary switch from non-oppression to

oppression and then back again. It's just rough dates. I chose them because they were symbolic of two events. One is the council of the Russian Orthodox Church in 1666 or 1667, which I think played a catastrophic role in the history of the Russian Orthodox Church, and 1999 as the coming to power of Putin. So that's why I took those two figures.

That oppression was basically that throughout these years a different civilizational model was imposed on the Russian people. It was the Western aristocratic model, then it was the Western oligarchic model, then – I call it Western – the Western Bolshevik-Marxist model, and then at the last we had again a return to the rule of the oligarchs during the Yeltsin years.

During all those years, I would say there were moments where of course, it fluctuated. Some were much more patriotic than others; some much more respectful than others of Russian culture; and some rulers were profoundly not interested in the Russian culture or hated it even; so it's not uniform. I would say that probably for the first time, most Russians feel that the person in power in Russia represents them and not some kind of elite above them; that person being Vladimir Putin.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** You write that: “For the first time in centuries, the ruler of the Kremlin is not somebody whom the West can hope to subdue or co-opt. Hence, the hysterical paranoia about Putin and his evil ‘Russkies.’ ” Are you amazed at the histrionics in the press and by everyone else about Russia and Putin?

**The Saker:** No, actually, I'm not. I'm amazed that they actually do it, but somewhere I am not, because it makes sense. You have to realize that – look at the history of Western attempts to subdue, invade, occupy and enslave Russia. A lot of them happened during the years when Russia was weak due to those internal contradictions. I would say, for instance, Russia had major

problems internally during the Napoleonic Wars. Russia had major problems internally during the Crimean War. Russia had fantastic problems during the First World War, which was stopped because of the Revolution, but had there not been a revolution Russia would have won that one, also.

So what happened is that the West truly fears a united Russia in which there would be a profound bond linking the people, the masses, and the person in power, which today is Putin. He embodies that. It is simply a country that is going to say, flat out: “No. No, we are not going to follow your model.” And Putin has been outspoken about that. He’s the first person that I’m aware of, certainly in the West, that has marked people; that says not only that we disagree on specific tactical issues, but we actually reject your civilizational model.

Now, there’ve been others. For instance part of the Muslim world, particularly the Iranian Islamic Republic has rejected the Western model. There is a model in Latin America, 21<sup>st</sup> century socialist or Chavism and all that movement. There are different movements that challenge the Western cultural supremacy and legitimacy, but Russia is the one that comes armed with nuclear weapons, the largest country on Earth, the largest reserves of fossil fuel and all sorts of riches. That makes it very powerful, and the West is frightened because it is true that Napoleon’s attack ended up with Russians in the center of Paris, and Hitler essentially brought the Russians to downtown Berlin.

So there is a fear, I think, a very profound fear, that Russia could eventually strike out and finally, if not attack then at least crush the empire by refusing to be subdued. I think that fear is well founded and I think this is exactly what we are witnessing today. I think the simple fact of existing independently is a mortal threat to the world hegemon.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** Has Russia ever lost a war? And could you

mention some of the very big wars against Russia? There have been so many I can't keep them straight.

**The Saker:** There are a lot of them. I would say that the closest thing to a loss of a war is the Crimean War, although even that is complicated. The consequences were pretty rapidly mitigated. I would argue that Russia won against Japan, and I know that most Japanese historians see it that way, but in the West it is considered that this was a war that Russia lost.

Russia can definitely lose battles, and even sometimes wars take a very long time until they prevail. They fought a long time against the Swedes, for instance. So it's not that Russia is necessarily invincible, but I think that Russia is truly unconquerable; to begin with due to geography.

And secondly, I do think that the Russian culture is so profoundly filled with military ethos and tradition that it really creates a different kind of soldier. It's hard to explain in a couple of words, but the mindset of the Russian soldier is very different from the mindset of the Western soldier. It's a cultural thing. It's collectivism, again. It's the willingness to sacrifice your life for the greater good. That's why you see the kind of resistance that you saw, for instance, during World War II in horrible battles that Western military simply never provided.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** You've written that every one of those wars was accompanied by a frenzied Russia-bashing campaign in the media and literature and all these wars were represented as being fought in the name of "lofty European values against the barbaric hordes," etc. You also say that, "In the years when Russia was not the object of a military attack she was always the object of economic sanctions under one pious pretext or another." Now, I didn't know that.

**The Saker:** Oh, yeah, – we can make short survey. For instance, there was something called the Northern Crusade. That

was when the papacy decided to either subdue or forcibly convert or kill all of the Orthodox people in the East. At that time, from a traditionalist papist point of view, Orthodox Christians were considered schismatics, rebels against the Holy Father. And that has been an ancient dream of Latin Christianity to finally, in one way or another, to absorb Orthodox Christianity. So you could say, that's a Western religious vendetta.

Then comes the political one. After freemasonry truly gained power in the UK and in France, Russia was seen as the backwards, obscurantist, Christian monarchy that was considered a threat to the Western order. So, therefore, Russia again became a target. And a large part of the Russian aristocracy actually even joined, became members of various masonic lodges. And yet when the war broke out between Russia and France, those very same Russians actually went and fought and died.

So even those Westernized and – it's not English but I will say it – “masonized” Russian aristocracy. They still fought for their country and if you read *War and Peace* you see that there's real patriotism even amongst those circles. So that was, again, a defeat of the ideology of the day in the West.

Then we have, of course, the episode with Hitler, who wanted to create a united Europe, who had the same exact rhetoric as the Ukrainians do today; which is that there are these Asian Mongol hordes in the East and we have to protect Western Civilization against those barbarians. And he added on top of that a racial theory which said that Russians were sub-humans, “*untermensch*”, and he had this drive to the East to give new lands to the master race. These things today sound ridiculous to us, but, let's be honest. That was the mainstream Western ideology in World War II. There's a reason Hitler took all of Europe without much of an effort.

So that was the order of the day, and again Russia resisted.



And now we went to the period after that where “democracy” (Western capitalism) became the big ideology. And Russia was communist. Yet again, they had to defend the free world against the commies, you know. There’s always a very justifiable ideological explanation, which not only permeates the newspapers but it eventually permeates literature and the general consciousness.

I really think there is an anti-Russian racism in many circles in the West. I’ve seen it myself many times, particularly when people don’t know that I myself am Russian. I’ve heard it. I’ve seen it. It’s there. And it’s a phobia in two senses, both fear and loathing. It’s a combination of both.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** You’ve written that, “gradually and insidiously the hatred and fear of Russia became part of the Western cultural identity.” And you’ve already basically been talking about this. Don’t you think that this is pathological?

**The Saker:** You know, it’s hard for me to judge, to speak of a pathology of an entire mix of society, because the West is not uniform. I should actually say, that’s actually probably a very important point. What I described are mostly northern Europeans, at least the recent phenomena. Southern Europe has been very different in its attitude towards Russia. And I also should have probably mentioned the competition between the British Empire and Russia, who was what prevented in many instances, the British Empire from ruling the way it wanted. So there still is a rabid Russophobia in the British elites nowadays. I would say much stronger than the United States, even.

So I don’t think it’s a pathology. I think it’s a consequence of the history, where there’s no clear natural border. Russians are white; they speak an Indo-European language which is close to other Slavic languages and further to the west like Polish or Serbian or Bulgarian. So on one hand, speaking as a non-Russian now - I’ll

take that hat on – they're kind of like us but then they're frustratingly not like us. They always end up not doing the right thing, so people get frustrated. And secondly, they judge the Russian people, the Russian culture by purely Western standards, and, of course, they get it wrong. It was very interesting for me during the Cold War to observe that the biggest authorities on Russia and the Soviet Union were, almost without exception, people who profoundly hated Russia and hated the Russian culture. I think of Richard Pipes as the perfect example of that kind of Russophobe.

I would say, by the way, if somebody's interested, Professor Stephen Cohen is probably right now one of the best specialists on Russia and the United States and he does not, I repeat not, at all display that anti-Russian character that most Russia specialists, or Soviet specialists during the Cold War, were almost always showing. "The Russians were bad guys." You could really tell that. He does not, so I highly recommend him. I respect the man, and whatever he says today is always worth listening to.

So yes, I think there is a global; you know – this has been going on for centuries, roughly a millennium. That's a lot of conflict, and it adds up, building the image of an enemy, sadly, but true.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** Earlier you made reference to Western freemasonry. What would be a simple explanation of freemasonry?

**The Saker:** I think there's an impossibility of simply explaining rapidly what freemasonry is. I would say, without going into details, it is a worldview first and foremost. It used to be an organization, and of course, still is, but it is the idea of progress, of civilization, of rational thinking. It's a very specific approach to religion, which I don't want to characterize here, and it is the ideas of enlightenment.

Basically, it's a mainstream ideology today. The values of the century today come straight out of masonic lodges. But honestly, I

cannot give a quick answer. That would take a full hour to even begin to outline. It's a very complex phenomenon, and it looks different in different countries. The French masonry is not the British is not the Russian is not the Italian. They're all very different. Is not the American. It's very complex. I cannot summarize it.

But I would just say that it is ideology at its core; is profoundly anti-Christian; is profoundly anti-monarchist; and that to a lot of Russians – it is only an antipathy and ideology for the elites, at least it was. It was for the people who self-identify themselves as being the elites; the thinkers; those who think free, who are free from prejudices and obscurantists and prejudice that they usually would say are in religious circles or monarchist circles.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** You've written that Putin's rule is a kind of very traditional Russian neo-monarchy, and that Putin has found a way to combine the external forms of democracy with the internal characteristics of Russian monarchy. Could you explain that a little bit?

**The Saker:** Yes. I would make a comparison. It's not a perfect one but just to illustrate the point. Look at modern Japan or, even more, Japan during the '70s probably. You had a country which is a democracy but, really, the country is run – the moral authority of the emperor is extremely high. And that is the same thing that's happening today in Russia. For the first time, I would say – if I had to say where the real center of power of Putin is, it is the popular consensus behind him. And he's extremely aware of it, and he caters to it very directly. He reaches out on a regular basis. He's very skillful at that.

For instance, it's very interesting. He has very long shows at least once a year which is a call-in show where people call in or write in and the audience asks him questions, and the kind of language he uses is a very popular one. I think he's not

misrepresenting himself; he's just presenting himself as somebody that is close to the people. And the people actually believe it this time around. All rulers always try to do that, but I don't think very many were successful, at least not in Russia.

I think it was Solzhenitsyn who said that the spectrum of all powers range from regimes whose authority is based on strength to those whose strength is based on authority. I would say that the strength of the Putin regime is based on his moral authority with the people; far more than the outcome of an election or, let's see now, what kind of money he has or doesn't have or the political party that supposedly is the main party backing him. It's much more complicated than that. I think that caters to a need Russians identify and like that. Russia is a country that has to be led by a strong person, for sure, but it has to be a person that people feel is on the side of the people and not trying to cater to the agenda of the wealthy elites.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** You write that the Chechen leader, Ramzan Kadyrov, created a personal guard for Vladimir Putin. What is that all about?

**The Saker:** It is absolutely true. He did. It wasn't very much commented on, but what he did is he took basically most of the elite's forces – I think it was 10,000 people at that time – in a stadium. It's on the Internet. You can find that. I have it on my blog somewhere. Basically, these people resigned their commission all together officially so as not to be bound by their legal obligations, and swore essentially an oath of allegiance to Vladimir Putin as a person – not to the president of Russia. Kadyrov clearly said that. He said this is a guard that is at the service of Vladimir Putin and anywhere you tell us to go, whatever orders you tell us to fulfill, we will do it.

But if you can interrupt here – if you want I can look up that quote and quote him more accurately. Do you want me to find

that?

**Bonnie Faulkner:** Okay, sure.

**The Saker:** Okay. I'm quoting now direct translation of the words of the leader of Chechnya, Ramzan Kadyrov. He said, "Today I repeat the words of Akhmad Hajji," which is his father who was murdered by terrorists. He continued, "It's time to make an informed choice. And we say to the entire world that we are the combat infantry of Vladimir Putin. If we receive an order we will actually prove that this is so. For 15 years, Putin has been helping our people. Now you and I – and we have 10,000 people, specially trained – ask the national leader of Russia to consider us a special voluntary unit of the commander-in-chief, ready to defend Russia and the stability of her borders, accomplish a combat mission of any complexity. We realize that our country has regular army, air force, navy and nuclear forces. However, there are tasks that can be solved only by volunteers, and we will solve them."

So this is absolutely fascinating, because of a number of things. It almost came to genocide of Chechens, I would say, between the two wars between Russia and Chechnya when Chechnya was ruled by Wahhabi extremists. And what happened was a very unique phenomenon in history. Two men decided to trust each other to stop that, Putin and the father of Ramzan Kadyrov, Akhmad Majik Kadyrov.

And it's amazing, Chechens used to be despised as being 'those Wahhabi terrorists,' etc. Now they're even fighting in the Donbass defending Russian Orthodox people, although they are themselves Muslims, against the Ukrainian Nazi death squads. That's how much it changed.

And Putin is extremely popular in Chechnya, as is the leader of Chechnya, and he basically returned to an old model. The Cossacks had the same model, which is basically the central power gives us very large autonomy, that we're responsible for the border,

and we'll be the shock units defending the country if needed. That's basically what Chechens do nowadays. They play a central role in Russian Special Forces, for instance, and have fully integrated Chechen Special Forces inside the Russian ones. We've seen them in Syria, and they were before in Lebanon. Chechen volunteers fight in the Donbass. They became sort of the shock troops, I would say, of Russia as a country.

And in that case, Putin never accepted it, of course, because he has to function within the bounds of law in Russia. But the message was a very powerful one, which means if somebody tries to, say, organize a revolution in Russia, I'm going to send 10,000 of my men to protect Putin as a person. And if you look at the video on my website – it's subtitled in English – you take a good look at the guys who showed up at that stadium; these are tough, tough, tough soldiers. You don't want to fight them. Chechens, even when Russians hated them during the war against the Wahhabis - never did the Russians say the Chechens were cowards or weak. They're extremely tough.

So that is the new function of Chechnya. The Chechens have become sort of the policemen of the caucuses, and they would be at the forefront, for instance, if the Wahhabi insurgency in Syria and Iraq – if it suddenly turned north in the worst case. Chechens would be absolutely at the forefront of fighting that. Now the entire military of the Chechens is sort of an elite force, and because they are Muslims it's much more intelligent to use them in Muslim countries, because there's a brotherhood between Muslims that non-Muslims would not share.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** How did the Wahhabis get in control of Chechnya in the first place?

**The Saker:** It was yet again thanks to the democrats. Just as the Bolsheviks seized Russia easily when Kerensky was in power, during the time of Yeltsin there was such chaos that people were

disgusted with the center. And it's important to remember, Yeltsin had just organized a bloodbath in Moscow in 1993 against the parliament. He basically did a completely illegal coup and the West applauded him, of course, enthusiastically for "restoring democracy." The regime that he put in power was corrupt to an infinite degree and it was a violent regime.

It began with a disagreement on the proceeding of the money that would come from gas and oil in Chechnya. Basically the regime around Yeltsin said, "We're not going to negotiate with these people. We'll just crush them militarily." What they had forgotten is that it's one thing to shoot at a parliament with tanks in Moscow and quite another to fight a small nation, admittedly, but an extremely tough one. I don't wish anybody to fight against the Chechens.

And on top of that, because the locals were so corrupt, the Chechens had inherited a huge amount of weapons from the Soviet military that they took under their control when they declared independence. The city of Grozny was a very heavily built, strong city with several fortified centers in the center of the city where they could fight very well, and the Chechens were motivated. They were not only motivated by Wahhabists; they also didn't want to deal with the kind of regime that was in Moscow.

So the Wahhabis came in and injected themselves there, just as they injected themselves in Syria, for instance, and in other places. They felt that this is a moment. There is a crisis; let's inject ourselves into that. And they gradually seized power by the usual methods of propaganda, corruption and violence within the Chechen opposition - let's call it this way to not characterize it. And the worse the Russian onslaught became the more people in Chechnya first thought, "You know what? These guys are fighting for us. Let's fight on their ... We'd rather have them than the federals."

So what happened then is again the same thing as in Syria - very similar. Eventually, the Wahhabis began their crazy stuff that they usually do everywhere, which is slave markets, torture, sharia law applied in a completely primitive way, terror. They began to do all the stuff that we see in Syria, and that's when the Chechen population said, "No, we don't want that." And that's when the person of Akhmad Hajji Kadyrov and then his son came in who said, basically, let's stop this war. It has to be stopped. We will get rid of the Wahhabis, which they did, but we also want our Muslim traditions to be fully respected, which they are, and they want not only cultural and economic autonomy but the center, because Putin did understand how important it was poured billions of rubles into rebuilding Grozny, which was flattened to the ground completely. Now it's one of the most prosperous cities. It's been rebuilt beautifully. So these two men basically at the last second changed the course of history, which could have been horrible.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** Well, now, the Wahhabi takeover of Chechnya was supported by the US CIA, wasn't it?

**The Saker:** Oh, absolutely, very much, and by the entire West. At that time the European Parliament was receiving a delegation of, of course, Chechen- what else? - "freedom fighters." They didn't call them good terrorists then, they didn't call them Mujahedeen, but they were freedom fighters and independentists, etc. The West was completely, to the hilt, pro-Chechen. Nobody cared about the horrors, the torture, the atrocities committed against Russian people first and then against Chechen people by the Wahhabis. Nobody cared.

The West got a little bit disgusted when the first English technicians who were building cell towers in Chechnya and began being decapitated, kidnapped, tortured, so when it hit eventually western expats, there was sort of a little cold that happened. But as long as these guys were butchering the locals, the West was giving



them a standing ovation. It's absolutely disgusting.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** In your article, "The Best Armed Forces on the Planet," you say that Russia is now the most powerful country on the planet because of two things: Russian rejection of the post-World War II US worldwide hegemony and what it represents, and because of Vladimir Putin's rock-solid support of the Russian people. How does the Russian rejection of the US model make Russia powerful?

**The Saker:** It makes Russia powerful out of proportion with her actual power economically or militarily because it sets a moral .. – it puts Russia in a position of moral leadership of resistance.

If you look, it all began with a speech I think in 2007 in Munich by Putin who basically told the West bluntly in its face the truth about the hypocrisy of its behavior and carnage, as we discussed last time, what it's supposed to stand for and what it really stands for. Recently we had a speech by Putin in the UN where he said, "Do you even understand what you have done?" speaking about the Middle East.

The fact that Russia would say that and, for instance, the Chinese never do even though economically they're infinitely more powerful than the relatively small Russian economy, puts Russia in a unique position, which is the one to be the spokesman, not the leader in an organizational sense but objectively we see it today, again, in Syria. Russia is the country, the only one, that can actually stop the US in its tracks, and the Russians are willing to do that.

Now, they're not doing that because – by the way, when I say they're willing to do that, I don't think they have much of an option. Most people realize in Russia that giving in and submitting to the Western demand is essentially turning Russia into Ukraine. They don't want that. They see what's happened to the Ukraine across the border, they say, "God forbid." They remember the 1990s and there's just no way they're going to let that happen.

So they took a stance, a firm one, already when the West was on the borders of Russia. It didn't happen very early. Whether it was Serbia who was hit Demarkov turned his airplane in the air, the foreign minister, and flew back, and Russia protested, but that was about it because it was an extremely weak country run by a pro-Western puppet regime.

During the Medvedev years Russia actually voted to put sanctions on Iran and even allowed a limited operation over Libya. The terms did not allow the West to do what it did, but it said only necessary means to implement the resolution, and after that we had the breakup of Libya.

Russia woke up late, and now she's literally fighting for her survival. But she did wake up and she's willing to fight. Other countries are not even willing to fight for their survival, and I would put in that category all of western Europe. They don't even have the spine to try to resist. Russia does.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** You debunk some popular myths about military strength including the importance of numbers, high technology and lots of expensive equipment. Could you talk about this in the context of the present-day Russian military? How would you characterize it?

**The Saker:** I would say that the biggest threat to the Russian military today is that the strategy, tactics, force planning, everything that the Russian armed forces do today is commensurate with the capabilities of Russia and is limited to defense. In other words, it's the opposite of what the US does. The US has overreached over the entire planet, has anywhere between 700 to 1,000 military bases worldwide. That's why the US spends such a huge amount of money on aggression.

The Russians have absolutely no desire, contrary to what the neocons say, to be an empire. They've done it. They've paid too much of a price. Russia has a purely defensive posture, has a very

limited power projection capability, actually. You can see that by the Russian operation in Syria, which in terms of numbers is actually very limited. And the truth is the Russian armed forces are not organized to operate that far; to sustain a military operation as far as Syria. That's really the edge.

Really what they're designed to do is prevail in a belt about 500 to 1,000 kilometers out across the perimeter of the Russian border. It is much more limited, it's much more defensive.

So what makes them that strong is that basically they're relying on the home advantage. Geography is very to the Russian advantage. In order to hit the Russians you have to get close to them. So in military terms, a huge advantage for Russia.

So for what it does, I think it's one of the best militaries or the best one right now in the world because of the kind of task it is given. It could never send an expeditionary force to Mexico or invade Uruguay or something like that, but they don't even try. That's the big thing. They use limited resources to make sure that they can achieve a very limited means. And that means is to win a war against any opponent including the US or NATO, in defense of Russia in the air and land and sea, and if it gets a nuclear war it is in full parity with the United States. I would actually give an advantage to Russian nuclear forces.

So that is a perfect combination, having advanced forces, very highly motivated troops that have changed a lot since the Chechen years where they couldn't even bring together a real brigade. They couldn't create a single real brigade. They had to glue it together from smaller units. Now, all Russian units are at a high degree of readiness. They're all equipped with modern gear. By 2020 they're supposed to have 70% of only modern gear everywhere across the Russian armed forces. So they're actually doing very well and the key thing, again, is that their objectives will never be something that is beyond what they could actually do.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** What is the difference between Atlantic Integration as opposed to Eurasian Sovereignty? You have written that the group behind Medvedev is the Atlantic Integrationists and the people behind Putin the Eurasian Sovereignists.

**The Saker:** It's a fundamental difference that really influences everything that happens in Russia today. So let's go back to the arrival of Putin to power. Right before him we had the regime of Yeltsin, which was an absolute disaster, a catastrophe. The country was literally breaking apart. I think Russia could have broken actually in two parts in the late 1990s. It was an absolute apocalypse

So what happened? Two groups, very different groups, got together and said, okay, we need to do something about it. On one hand it was big money, oil industry, gas industry, all the money group, the people, and that was Medvedev, and the people who pushed up Putin who were the foreign intelligence service, but he really represented, I would say more generally, the security services. And they did a compromise, something like I think was maybe tried with Trump and Pence, which was we put one of you guys and one of us guys up there and they sort of will balance each other out.

And it worked like that. It was pretty much, on one hand, Dmitri Medvedev was representing the pro-Western IMF type. His goal was to have Russia as an equal partner, accepted by the West. He didn't apply for NATO but I think I would not have put it past him to do that, or to become somewhat integrated within the European structures. He wanted Russia very much to become like maybe a big Poland or something like that. And the overriding, of course, value of these people is money, money and economics. That's what they're in for.

Putin came from a very different background. I would call him an officer. It doesn't really matter that he was a foreign intelligence officer as opposed to a military officer. He comes from what's

called in Russia the Force Ministries. It's the part of the country, the special services, intelligence community, military, etc., and his view is a dramatically different one. These people are profoundly opposed to the Western civilizational model, have no desire of Russia becoming part of the West. For one thing, they know it's futile. They will never be accepted by the West. So their idea is much more to, first of all, re-sovereignize Russia. I don't think that's English but I use that term – to make Russia fully sovereign again, which she still isn't, and secondly, to not turn Russia's back on the West but simply stop staring with fixation towards the West. If you look at all the leaders that we discussed earlier in the show, from Peter the Great to Yeltsin, all of them – all of them – were constantly thinking about the West and what the West does and Europe, Europe, Europe, Europe, Europe. Some of them were pro-European, others were less pro-European, but that was the big thing – the important direction was Westward.

The people around Putin think very differently. They see the south, they see the east including Siberia, and they even see the north, the Arctic circle, which they think is extremely important. So they want to decouple Russia to a certain degree from the dollar, the Western economy, the Western legal systems and basically, just turn, shift Russia away towards another civilizational model. And they also believe that the Russian values should be different from the ones that the West advocates. So it's a pragmatic, it's a cultural and it's even a spiritual desire for a uniqueness, of fully fostering a distinct, separate Russian civilizational realm.

And these two groups have been fighting each other. They still are. Now, the problem for the first group, the Atlantic Integrationists, is the personal fantastic popularity of Putin, which is not at all shared by Dmitry Medvedev. He is not that popular; his government is even less popular. So they're keeping a low profile because right know they know it's not a good time for them. But

they're still here and they're definitely the biggest threat for Putin, and they're the ones who constantly sabotage what he is trying to do.

So there is this internal struggle, which is very powerful and can be compared to the kind of struggle that we saw taking place shortly but very strongly between the neocons and, I would say, Bannon and Flint, who were ejected. The ejections happen less often in Russia but they are there. The last score was Putin scoring well when he kicked out the minister of economics, who was particularly hated for a long while. So he's getting more and more strong but he's far from having full control – very far from that still.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** Saker, thank you so much again.

**The Saker:** It's a huge pleasure, and thanks to you.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** I've been speaking with the Saker. Today's show has been: "In Search of Russia." The Saker was born in a military family of white Russian refugees in western Europe where he lived most of his life. After completing two college degrees in the United States, he returned to Europe where he worked as a military analyst until he lost his career, due to his vocal opposition to the Western-sponsored wars in Chechnya, Croatia, Bosnia and Kosovo. After re-training as a software engineer, he returned to the United States where he now lives with his family. He has been blogging since 2007 as the Saker, and his essays have attracted a large audience. He is the author of *The Essential Saker: From the Trenches of the Emerging Multipolar World*. Visit [thesaker.is](http://thesaker.is). IS stands for Iceland.

Guns and Butter is produced by Bonnie Faulkner, Yarrow Mahko and Tony Rango. Visit us at [gunsandbutter.org](http://gunsandbutter.org) to listen to past programs, comment on shows, or join our email list to receive our newsletter that includes recent shows and updates. Email us at [faulkner@gunsandbutter.org](mailto:faulkner@gunsandbutter.org). Follow us on Twitter at [gandbradio](https://twitter.com/gandbradio).



# Trump and Putin - Setting the Record Straight – Guns & Butter Interview

May 3, 2017

This is Guns and Butter.

*In Russia, you know, the real front lines of the battle for power are not in the Duma and they're not in the demonstrations in the streets. They're behind the scenes, absolutely. The kind of fight that took place that replaced the Bannon and the Flint people in the United States, that kind of thing is what has been happening since pretty much 1993, 1995 in Russia, the behind-the-scenes struggle of people who are close to power. That's where the real fight is.*

I'm Bonnie Faulkner. Today on Guns and Butter, Andrei Raevsky, who blogs as the Vineyard Saker at [thesaker.is](http://thesaker.is). Today's show: "Trump and Putin: Setting the Record Straight." The Saker was born in a military family of white Russian refugees in western Europe, where he lived most of his life. After completing two college degrees in the United States, he returned to Europe where he worked as a military analyst until he lost his career, due to his vocal opposition to the Western-sponsored wars in Chechnya, Croatia, Bosnia and Kosovo. After re-training as a software engineer, he returned to the United States where he now lives with his family. He has been blogging since 2007 as the Saker, and his analysis has taken the Internet by storm. He is the author of *The Essential Saker: From the Trenches of the Emerging Multipolar World*. Today we discuss the new Trump administration, the neocons, the wars in the Ukraine and Syria, parallels between the former Soviet Union and the United States, US/Russia relations, Iran, Putin and the possibilities of war.



**Bonnie Faulkner:** Saker, welcome to the program.

**The Saker:** Thank you. It is a real pleasure and a big honor. I have been following your work for many years and I am a big admirer, so it's really my honor and my pleasure.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** Well, the feeling is mutual. It's great to have you on the program finally. Many who voted for Donald Trump for president did so because his campaign promised a major shift in US foreign policy away from neocon foreign wars. Trump consistently said he would seek a rapprochement with Russia and wanted to work with Russia to eliminate the violent jihadis. With the resignation of General Mike Flynn, the demotion of Steve Bannon, the elevation of Jared Kushner and others to the National Security Council and then the launch of 59 Tomahawk missiles targeting a Syrian military base and the subsequent dropping of a Mother of all Bombs on Afghanistan, it's feeling like Hillary Clinton won the election, at least with regard to foreign policy. What do you think is going on?

**The Saker:** Well, it is hard to be certain of what is going on but what I will say is there has been a successful coup, in my opinion, against the people who originally backed Trump, again, Flynn, Bannon and a lot of people in the United States – the Ron Paulians, the libertarians, the pacifists, all the people who wanted basically an end to the empirical megalomania that Hillary promised us.

What happened is that I think they broke the man once he got to the White House. He wanted to drain the swamp, and the swamp drowned him, instead, completely. I think it's finished. I even had an article that I wrote, I think in February, where I said basically – that was after the firing of Flynn when I said, "It's finished. That's it. Nothing is going to happen."

I can actually prove it to you very easily. There's a consistency in those actions. When he wanted to go after ISIS or Daesh, if you want to call them that, Islamic States, al Qaeda, it was absolutely

clear I think for everybody that there would be no American boots on the ground, not in a sufficient amount to actually engage in an offensive ground operation.

What does that leave? That leaves only two countries that can actually fight. The US could do something from the air or from the sea but certainly not from the ground. On the ground, it's Syria, it's Iran and it's Hezbollah. Those are the three players who have sufficient amounts of firepower boots on the ground.

Well with that missile strike, Trump made that impossible. So now that he made that impossible, since there's not going to be boots on the ground that will fight the Wahhabi crazies – what I call the Wahhabi crazies – if there's not going to be boots on the ground doing it nobody else will do it, which means that his central campaign promise of obliterating al Qaeda or Daesh, whatever you want to call them, will simply never happen. That's it.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** Why do you say that his missile attack automatically means that there won't be any boots on the ground?

**The Saker:** There will never be American boots on the ground. I just don't think that's something that anybody seriously thinks is going to happen, because it's going to take more – there's several thousand Americans right now on the ground there but that's not what we're talking about. If you want to control land – and that's true for Korea, too, by the way, you have to have boots on the ground. From the air, you can do a certain amount of damage, and even that is limited. So what happens then is that the only boots possible would be the Syrians and the Iranians, but they will not work with Trump after what he did during that attack and all the rhetoric on top of that. Iran is blacklisted by Trump as being the prime sponsor of terrorism on the planet. Even Flynn, actually, said that. And Syria is again being accused of engaging in chemical attacks.

To me, the purpose of that attack was precisely to make any

collaboration between the United States and Russia impossible, and I think that's where we are right now. I just don't see, unless a another miraculous 180-degree turn happens, which I don't believe will, right now with the current mindset and the policies of the Trump administration, there's no collaboration with Syria, Iran, Russia or Hezbollah, those four being the ones that are needed to crush al Qaeda or ISIS on the ground.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** In your article, "A Multi-level Analysis of the Cruise Missile Attack on Syria and Its Consequences," you quote the Russians as having said that only 23 cruise missiles hit the airfield. The others are unaccounted for. You go on to say that, "What matters is that the Russians have basically leaked the information that they are capable of turning cruise missiles around." What indicates that Russia has this capability?

**The Saker:** Well, they've never admitted it as such. Their official description of their electronic warfare kits said that that kind of capabilities would be in the future. However, you have to explain the disappearance of these missiles. I think the first fact, that both Russia and the US agree that there were 59 missiles, I think we can take that to the bank. How many actually hit the airfields is best proven by looking that the airfield was working basically on the next day, with footage on the ground, by the way, confirming that the runways were un-hit and that there were a limited amount of hits. The airport was functioning. Russian journalists, by the way, were driving around the airport with no chemical protection gear, which means there was no sarin gas there – which, by the way, indicates to me the Americans knew that because if there had been sarin gas there, I don't think they would have used cruise missiles to hit it.

So what are the other options? Those missiles being shot down. I doubt it because those missiles can follow very low tracks, which are designed to avoid the most effective air defense system in

Syria, and those are the Russian ones, which are, by the way, tasked with only defending Russian positions; they're not tasked with defending Syrian positions. So it would have been fairly easy for the United States to just fly these cruise missiles in on tracks staying away from the Russian positions.

I think the Russians detected that launch. They have all sorts of means to detect that and I've seen one map where they say that the missiles basically came from the south, flew to Israel and then turned north to hit the objectives in Syria. In that case, the Russian missiles would not even have had the range to hit them. And the Syrians don't have enough, I think, air defenses, and most of them are old, to destroy that amount of missiles.

So the only possible explanations left are two. Either Trump deliberately pushed a number of them into the sea to say that he hit with many but to make sure there's not enough damage. I don't think that's a real possibility. It's a theoretical one but I don't see anybody wasting that amount of money in doing that. Or electronic warfare kit by the Russians. The Russians have released one – the company that actually builds most of the central components of the Russian electronic warfare kits, called KRET – there is a drawing that I show in my article where you can clearly see a cruise missile turning around, making a sharp turn and weaving away from its intended targets. So the Russians are saying they're developing these possibilities. My guess is that they already have them and that they have used them.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** Well now, how is all of this going to affect US / Russia relations? You've mentioned that Trump's cruise missile attack on Syria has ended any possible collaboration with Iran and also with Russia, you're saying.

**The Saker:** I think it's not that the Russians will be sitting and pouting and refusing to work with Trump. I think they would be available to do things with the Americans, but I think the mindset

of the people surrounding Trump right now is such a degree of Russophobia that no substantial political, particularly on the definitive issues of North Korea, Syria and the Ukraine, I don't see a collaboration happening. If anything, the reaction in Russia – first of all, you want to show strength, but in the Russian mindset that actually shows weakness. If you have to make shows of force it means you're insecure and you're trying to frighten somebody, so it has the exact opposite effect. Same thing for his bullying of North Korea. If anything, that's interpreted as a sign of weakness.

Secondly, I mentioned there's a word in Russian. It's nyetagoberespasogni, which means literally not agreement-capable, and that's what they have said several times about the Obama administration. I'm afraid that going to pretty much come to the same conclusion, that the Trump administration is not agreement-capable, and therefore they're going to – If Trump offers something that's in their interests, yeah, they'll take it and they'll work together. But compared to the prospects, what we could have reasonably hoped for, it's nothing compared to the potential. The clear, the biggest one for me is that meaningful destruction of ISIS on the ground. I think the Americans and the Russians together could have achieved that result. That, unfortunately, is not going to happen. I do not see a collaboration on the Ukraine, either, by the way, so these are the two main ones. Where there was hope of working together, now it's finished.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** Right, and so obviously the Trump administration, at this point, is not going to go – it doesn't look like they're going to go after ISIS or any of the jihadis at all, right?

**The Saker:** They'll probably go after them symbolically. Look at the time it took – they still haven't taken Mosul, by the way. So you're talking about a superpower that's not capable of taking one city in Iraq. What are they going to do? They're going to probably have air strikes, probably have more cruise missile strikes, maybe

some of them will directly hit ISIS, but it's always going to be for show. The real thing is ISIS stays because Israel wants it to stay and the Trump administration is not serious about getting rid of them.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** How far do you think Russia will go in helping the Assad government in Syria?

**The Saker:** I'd say short of an overt war with the United States they will go as far as needed. And even the overt war depends on what would trigger it, because there's a domino effect here that the Russians understand very well. First of all, Syria is a crucial ally for Russia, but Syria is also a symbol. The Russians absolutely are insisting that they want respect for international law, and giving up Syria to the United States is basically a wholesale abandonment of international law. That cannot be allowed. I don't think China wants that, either. These two countries are working on a multipolar world, and if Syria is handed over to Daesh or al Qaeda, that's the end of international law. It's completely illegal.

Furthermore, if there's a domino effect, Iran would be next. I don't think anybody doubts that. Also, make no mistake, if Assad is overthrown and the Wahhabi crazies make it to power in Damascus, the next thing they will do is turn on Lebanon. There have been already combats between al Qaeda types and Hezbollah in Lebanon, and there is a reason why Hezbollah has sacrificed so many fighters in that war – because they know they're next.

So I don't think that the Russians or the Lebanese or the Iranians see that they have the option of letting al Qaeda come to power in Damascus and just do nothing about it, so I think they would do pretty much whatever it takes and whatever is in their power to not allow that to happen. I think that's how important it is for them.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** That is absent going to war against the US. What do you think the possibilities are of a confrontation, militarily, between the US and Russia?

**The Saker:** Well, I should qualify what I said. I don't think they would do something that could justify and trigger a US attack on Russia. However, if Russian soldiers or forces are attacked, I also am convinced that they will fire back, and that tells you how close we are to a war right now. I think we're in a much worse situation than during the Cuban Missile Crisis, because I think the people in power in the United States are playing a game of nuclear chicken, and they think they can win.

The problem is on the Russian side, the Russians have retreated as far as they possibly could, which is literally to their borders. They're not retreating any further. They can't. And therefore, if they are pushed they will fight a war with the United States.

As early as 2015 I wrote an article saying Russia's preparing for war, and ever since, Russia has been proactively preparing for a major war with the United States. There have been exercises on a military level, the banking system has exercised how to survive and operate in war conditions, civil defense has been working on it. There's a paradox here. The Russians are afraid of war because they know what it is, but they're also ready for it, and if they're pushed to that extremity they will fight and fight back. There's no doubt in my mind whatsoever.

What they will not do is escalate in a way which would force the United States to respond. That they're not going to do, say sink an aircraft carrier or even attack American positions in retaliation. We've seen that with the Turks shooting down the Russian aircraft. The Russians will go as far as they possibly can. War for them, actually shooting, is an absolute last resort. They will never take that as the first measure, which is what the Americans are doing right now. That's the first thing they turn to.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** What is the geopolitical strategy behind this saber rattling against Russia?

**The Saker:** I don't think there is a geopolitical strategy other than a combination of two things. Fundamentally, the neocons hate Russia. As a culture, as a nation, the Orthodox faith, everything Russia has represented in her history, the neocons have a profound ideological hatred for. The second thing is that Russia – and I think China's in the same category – both these countries have renounced the concept of empire. They've paid too dearly a price for it. What they're pushing for is a multi-national, multipolar world order, and that is something that's not acceptable to somebody who wants the United States to be an empire.

That was the big hope with Trump - the people backing him wanted to sacrifice the empire and save the United States whereas the people backing Hillary were people who were willing to sacrifice the United States and the American people for the sake of the global empire. I think that really was essentially correct, before he made his 180 degrees, that these were the forces who were battling inside the US elites. People who took power now basically are hardcore neocon imperialists. They have no use for anything but a world hegemony for the United States.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** So could you talk a little bit about the neocons? Now, obviously, it looks like the neocons have been successful at taking over the Trump administration, so it looks like it's going to be a continuation of business as usual. What about the neocon worldview and their philosophy, their ideas? What are we dealing with?

**The Saker:** I think we're dealing with a select group of people who perceive themselves as the chosen people, who believe that they naturally have a right to rule the entire planet, and I think they use the United States for that purpose. I don't think of them at all as American patriots. I think American patriots have no need for the kind of empire that the neocons want to build.

I think they're motivated basically by ideology. These are not



pragmatic people at all. These are hardcore ideologists, a lot of them former Trotskyites, either because their parents were or they themselves actually, in certain cases, were. You can find all that on Google if you look up Trotsky and neocons.

And I think they're people who basically want to run the entire planet. That's their highest value, I think. I don't think they're ideologists in a positive sense of the world. If anything, they're idealists. They're megalomaniacs. Racist megalomaniacs is how I would characterize them. They're clever and they are very motivated. That's why they're so powerful.

And that's the case with many minorities. Usually we are taught that democracy is a system that protects minorities against majorities, but in reality, that's the biggest failure of democracy because what happens is that minorities end up oppressing majorities. Because minorities are not more clever or more intelligent but they are far more driven. Usually they're single-topic voters and actors, and their agenda's very narrow and they're driven by it very powerfully. Whereas the majority are usually much more diverse and they look at things in a broad range of issues. They don't identify themselves by a single political agenda. I think the neocons do.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** That's a very good and profound analysis. No, I've noticed, that's absolutely right. You see it everywhere, where it's the minority populations that are being catered to as victims or something.

**The Saker:** Yes, absolutely. Exactly. And that also goes externally. You notice that the US empire always supports the minority against the majority in pretty much any place. And you know why? It's very simple. Because the minority will then become dependent. The majority does not need an external actor to be the majority and the strongest player on the block. The minority does.

So helping minorities looks politically good. It makes you look

sensitive and being the good person, but at the same time it's a very cynical and very primitive political ploy, really, both internally and externally.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** Yes, and that's very interesting that you mention that democracy leads to that. That's true, now that you mention it and I think about it. That's right.

**The Saker:** In a system where participation is voluntary, for instance, you're always going to have the minorities who are highly driven. They're going to have a disproportionate amount of votes, for instance. The same thing – people who identify themselves as belonging to a group, say Group A, will take decisions in business that are going to be very different from the majority people. The majority people deal with other majority people. The minority people, every time they look at a specific, say, business partner or somebody they would promote, they think, “Is he with Group A or is he not with Group A? Does he promote my interests or not?” So by being highly parochial and extremely single-topic motivated they achieve a totally disproportionate success ratio in a system that does nothing to impede them and actually proactively protects them.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** I very much appreciated your analysis in your piece “How the Ukrainian Crisis Will Eventually Bring Down the Anglo-Zionist Empire.” That's included in your book, *The Essential Saker: From the Trenches of the Emerging Multipolar World*. You write that, “What the Anglo-Zionists are openly and publicly defending in the Ukraine is the polar opposite of what they are supposed to stand for. That is an extremely dangerous thing to do for any regime, and the Anglo-Zionist empire is no exception to that rule.” What is actually taking place in the Ukraine, as opposed to what is being claimed?

**The Saker:** Well, I think there's two ways of looking at it. We can go into a great deal of detail but I would suggest we take the

simple approach. It's straightforward. You have a coup, which was organized by the betrayal of the president in power. By the way, the president in power was a corrupt individual. He wasn't pro-Russian, but he was not a rabid Russophobe so that's why he's accused of being pro-Russian.

A coup took place even though the Europeans gave security guarantees. They promised that a deal would be made between the opposition and President Yanukovich. The coup brought into power a group of people who came to power by violence and a good chunk of which were at best rabid nationalists, at worst outright Nazis – including, I would say, a whole bunch of anti-Jewish-feeling people and somehow in the West which tends to – in the West we're always told we have to have special subjectivity and never allow anti-Semitic discourse, etc. Well, in the Ukraine it seems to be perfectly kosher to be a Jew-hating nationalist, and the neocons and the Americans and the Europeans, they all put up with that, no problem.

The second thing that happened is even after the coup there was no necessity for a civil war. I can give an evidence of that, something very interesting if people have time to check it. Look at the flag the people were waving in the eastern Ukraine, the Donbas, even in Crimea. They were protesting. They didn't like the coup, they didn't like the plans to make the Russian language unofficial and they wanted some degree of decentralization, but look at the flags. They were mostly Ukrainian flags.

But after Turchynov, the acting president at that time, declared basically war and sent the military to crush the people in the east, then that changed and turned into a full-scale civil war. So the values that were betrayed here are democracy, self-determination for the people, standing up to national socialists and rejecting Nazi-inspired ideologies. All these things that the West for years has been claiming to uphold and even embody, they were

all betrayed – all betrayed.

I won't even go into the false flags, all the hypocrisy of saying that the Russians have forces in the eastern Ukraine when the West has forces in the rest of the Ukraine, and they speak of Russian volunteers in the Donbass but they don't speak about the Polish, German, American, Italian, Canadian and other volunteers in the Ukraine.

The Ukraine has been a fantastic exercise in doublethink. Is that the world that Orwell used in English? I haven't read it in English, but double thought or double think. And a complete hypocrisy. Absolutely a wholesale abandonment of all the lofty principles that the West stood for during the Cold War.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** In your article, “How the Ukrainian Crisis Will Eventually Bring Down the Anglo-Zionist Empire,” are you saying that the hypocrisy of what they're saying they're doing as opposed to what they're really doing is becoming so obvious that people are just going to see through it?

**The Saker:** Yes, I think so, and that's something I observed in the Soviet Union, actually, during the communist years. At the end, there may be a hard core of idealists but mostly everybody knew that the system was rotten to the core and nobody really stepped forward to defend it, be it to 1991 or after that. People were basically – they couldn't do anything. They couldn't vote them out of office. But they were making jokes about the communist regime, and they were disgusted with it. It was a general sense. Everybody knew that it was a complete hypocrisy.

And I see that happening in the United States, too. I've been living in this country for now a total of almost 20 years, and I see how this has changed. It's interesting. Those who do still believe in American values actually are usually pretty sympathetic to Putin, and often I hear, “This guy actually stands for American values.” I don't think anybody seriously believes that the powers that be in

Washington DC stand for the American values and the values on which the republic was built. Free speech, we know it's a joke; international law, we know it's a joke; human rights, we know it's a joke; torture, we know it's a joke. Can you name me a single value that officially the United States stands for that people still take seriously? Not for themselves – they do – but that they believe that those in power actually uphold and struggle for. I can't name a single one.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** Exactly. You mentioned the usual reasons given for the dissolution of the Soviet Union, including the war in Afghanistan, the drop in oil prices, etc., but you have your own view on why the Soviet system fell apart. What do you think was the most important factor? And you've already started talking about that.

**The Saker:** The single most important factor was, I think, a decision by party elites to break up the country into 15 little parts that they would still continue running but separately. So the Soviet Union never fell apart; it was broken apart. But I would say right on par with the importance of that action of the party elites is the general sense of total disgust with the ideology and the hypocrisy of the system.

The war in Afghanistan – believe me, the Russians could have stayed there another 10 or 20 years and the war never brought down the Soviet Union, most definitely not. Neither did the Polish Solidarnosc strikes in Poland. Reagan's arm race and the fall in oil prices did contribute. It did contribute to weakening the Soviet economy. But just like today we have sanctions against Russia, they do have an effect but much worse is the actual policies of the economic ministries within the government, which are I think are much more responsible for the crisis in Russia.

The same thing happened in the Soviet Union. Yes, it did contribute to it, but the prime cause of the circumstances which led

to the breakup of the Soviet Union was the incompetence of the party that was running it.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** And then also the fact that, what, Russian citizens no longer believed in it. You know, I actually went to the Soviet Union once. I think it was in the winter of '81/'82. It could have been '80/'81, but anyway, it was right after Brezhnev had died and there was an interim guy in there. I think his name was Andropov or something.

**The Saker:** Andropov, yes. Andropov.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** Yes. Anyway, a friend of mine's son had graduated from the Pushkin Institute and so we went over there. It was quite unusual; I don't think many Americans went there. Because our friend had graduated from this Pushkin Institute, we got to socialize with a lot of Russians, a lot of young people and their parents, and it was very clear. They made fun of the government. They didn't believe in any of it.

**The Saker:** Oh, yeah. And let me add one thing. Actually, there were communists in Russia who did not give up their belief in the communist values and ideals, but even they could only despise the ruling elites, the *nomenklatura*, that ran the Soviet Union, which is similar like here today. People who are disgusted with the Anglo-Zionist empire, and the people in DC did not give up American values as embodied in the amendments to the Constitution and the founding father writings. These are different things.

People say that communism was defeated in the Soviet Union. No. The Soviet system was truly hated by everybody, but I think a lot of people still kept in their hearts certain values that communism was dear to them. They just didn't see it at all as represented by the regime.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** Right, exactly. What are more parallels between the crumbling Soviet Union and the United States today?

You list 20 additional similarities. They're quite striking. What are some of them?

**The Saker:** Well, my list begins with a bloated military budget, which results paradoxically in an ineffective military. And I would say the US military today is very ineffective, and so was the Soviet one, by the way. It was huge, but it was ineffective.

- Second is a huge and ineffective intelligence community
- A crumbling public infrastructure
- A world record of per capita ratio of incarcerated people. The United States has the highest rate right now, followed by Russia still, by the way. That problem's not over there.
- A propaganda machine
- Internal dissident movements, which we definitely have in the United States.
- Systematic use of violence against citizens; we have that here.
- Tensions between the central authority and the local, the regions or the states.
- An industry that exports energy and weapons.
- A population that's fearful of being spied on.
- Systematic, dissidents and people who disagree are described as traitors or spies; we see that very clearly with the Snowden case.
- A paranoia of external enemies.
- Overreach over the entire planet. Here I'm at 13. I can continue down the list if you want.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** Keep going.

**The Saker:** An awareness the entire planet hates you. That was very much true in the Soviet Union. People knew that they were hated. They were absolutely aware of that.

- A subservient press corps of prostitutes who never dare to ask the real questions
- A sky-high rate of substance abuse
- A young generation that believes in nothing at all
- An educational system in freefall, and I would argue the Soviet one was better than the current American one.
- A disgust with politics and politics in general
- A massive prevailing amount of corruption at all levels of power.

You see exactly all of those in both cases.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** In 2014 you wrote that, “The truth is the most powerful empire buster ever invented. It brought down the USSR and it will bring down the Anglo-Zionists, too. It is just a matter of time now.” We’ve talked about some of the striking parallels between the former Soviet Union and present-day US. How do you think the dissolution of the empire will come about, or what it will look like? Do you have any vision of this or any opinion on it?

**The Saker:** You know, it’s funny that you would ask that. I mentioned that very often in my writings. I never actually sat down and had the time to offer a possible scenario. I would just say that I think that it’s going to happen by an eternal shock, first.

The United States being protected by sea and by a lot of military power – that’s the two things that kept the US going, is first of all geography, and secondly, you could always impose the dollar on everybody. People speak of gold-backed currency, or fiat, I call it aircraft carrier-backed currency – currency that you can impose upon everybody who doesn’t want to be bombed by you. And that worked.

Those two things are coming to an end. First of all, the United States military is in bad shape and is not frightening the opponents



of the US empire today. It's one thing to go after Qaddafi or to overthrow Saddam Hussein. It's a totally different proposition to go after Iran, and I won't even go to China or Russia.

Secondly, the world is becoming smaller and there are ways now – for instance, say, if a war had broken out during the Cuban missile crisis, a couple of Soviet nukes could have reached the United States and done damage, and once they were removed the United States, at least the mainland, the homeland, was out of danger. Now the Russians can use conventional – I repeat conventional – systems that can basically inflict huge damage on the United States. So that's a big difference. In the past, only the other side could have had war on your doorstep. Now the United States are actually taking the risk for the US territory.

So I think eventually it's going to end up with a shock. Something might go very wrong. For instance, Korea. God forbid, if Trump actually decides to use military power against North Korea, I think the consequences of that could be so severe that they would bring up either a combination of local uprisings or, what I think is more likely, a breakup of the country into states that want to go different ways and don't need the empire for themselves at all.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** You've also mentioned Iran. Now, Russia is a close ally, I believe, of Iran. You've written that, "The West, fully controlled by Zionist interests, is hell-bent on a confrontation with Syria and Iran." This confrontation is already happening Syria. Obviously, and you write about it, Obama had to drop this escalation of the Syrian thing. I remember that the British Parliament wouldn't support it. I can't remember all the details. Then, of course, the United States struck the nuclear deal with Iran. How do you think Iran figures in this? You've said that if Syria fell then the next target, of course, would be Iran. They're just in a stalemate now, aren't they?

**The Saker:** Pretty much. First of all, I would say that Iran is a close ally with Russia but not because there's some kind of strong mutual love but because they basically understand, both sides understand that they need each other pretty badly. For Russia, first and foremost, Iran is the counterweight to al Qaeda in the region. That is the only country that can keep all this Daesh/ISIS thing down or even help maybe in the future eliminate it. So Russia really needs Iran because next it's going to be the caucuses.

And the Iranians realize they are big, they're powerful, but they can't be completely alone, either. They need Russia and China to back them. So it's a coalition that was never formalized this way but essentially going for the little guy. Hezbollah depends on Syria, which depends on Iran, which depends on Russia, and Russia and China are in a symbiosis. That's how I would sort of present the structure of that informal alliance.

The reason why Iran is in the crosshairs of the neocons for all these years has nothing to do with nuclear weapons, actually. Iran probably never had much of a nuclear weapons program. We know that it hasn't had one since. I'm actually convinced of that.

The real problem is that for Israel, Iran is becoming – Israel used to be the local superpower in the Middle East. Iran is not only a competitor but it's a viable one, one that's not afraid and one that is in your face. They denounce Israel. They denounce the Anglo-Zionist empire in very direct terms.

So there's a risk of shifts of power both for the Israelis and the Saudis, too. That's the other big – they're maybe not as powerful militarily as Israel but they're very rich, and they want to be the other power that is going to control the Middle East.

So what we have right now is a paradoxical alliance of the Saudi Wahhabis and the Israeli Zionists, together working – and of course, protected by the United States – all basically going after Iran, because the end goal is Iran. Syria by itself or even Lebanon

by itself is not worth that kind of effort. Iran is.

But I don't think they have a chance at all to prevail against Iran, and I think they've come to that realization. The closer they come to a scenario of war, the more they run through the scenarios, the more they realize, no, it's just not going to happen. A war against Iran would look very much like the war that Israel imposed on Lebanon in 2006 and would be a great deal of destruction in Iran, like the Israelis inflicted a great deal of destruction in southern Lebanon and general Lebanon, and then nothing. They wouldn't be able to hold ground for very long. They can't invade that country; it's way too big, the people are way too strong. This is not a country that can be taken easily – the United States nowadays is in no condition to suppress it militarily. And that is the big frustration for them. They wish they could but they can't.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** You've done an awful lot of research on Russia and you're quite familiar with the situation there. You've written a lot about different historical periods in Russia. Now, I was reading some sort of a financial commentator saying, about that demonstration in Moscow, it says, "While President Putin is expected to be reelected, the Kremlin was reportedly shaken by last month's anti-corruption protests in Moscow led by Alexei Navalny, which represented the largest anti-government demonstrations in five years." Well, from what you know of Russia, is there really any viable protests or power against Putin and the government? Putin's quite popular, isn't he?

**The Saker:** Yes, of course. That quote is utter nonsense. The person has no idea what they're talking about. Putin is popular at a solid 80%-plus. What is true is that the governments of Medvedev is less popular, and those in charge of economics are even less popular, and I would say that I agree with that sentiment. I think that what Russia does in the foreign policy is very good; internal

policies are not that satisfactory and there's a big problem. And I'll explain in a minute where it comes from.

But just to address the issue of the demonstrations, have there been any demonstrations of any notice in the past five years? That's why this one looked big. The reality is that Russia has a multi-party political system where pro-Western parties can run. They can't even make it to the Duma. They've failed the 5% barrier. The support for the West and for people like Navalny in Russia must be somewhere in the 2-3% range. However, in Moscow it's going to be substantially higher, in bigger cities, and a lot of the Russian elites don't like and even hate Putin very much, and that's where the real opposition to him is.

There's three oppositions in Russia. The first one is the fake opposition pretty much financed by the CIA, like Navalny and the rest of them, which are a joke. They're not any more representative of the Russian people today than the dissidents were during the Soviet era. That's a Western-created myth.

The second part of the opposition is that a good part of the elites, which Putin prevents from running the country like they did in the 1990s. Now there is a very powerful threat and enemy to Putin. They have their people all over the place. Even in the Russian government today there still are these IMF types, the World Bank types, basically the globalists. They have a lot of money and they're supported by the elites. Now, that is an informal but very dangerous and formidable opposition to Putin. But it's not one that has a party that goes to Parliament because they know they're never going to win anything.

Then there's a third opposition, which is the system opposition, which are the parties which are formally not supporting the Putin presidency; have differences with him, but generally pretty much agree with him. That's pretty much what you have in the parliament today, the Duma. You have the party of

Zhirinovskiy – that's a communist nationalist group, I would qualify them. There's a communist party and there is a party called Just Russia. So they're not very active. They're pretty much a rubber-stamp Duma right now.

So in Russia, the real front lines of the battle for power are not in the Duma and they're not in the demonstrations in the streets; they're behind the scenes, absolutely. The kind of fight that took place that replaced the Bannon and Flynn people in the United States, that kind of thing is what has been happening since pretty much 1993-95 in Russia, the behind-the-scenes struggle of people who are close to power. That's where the real fight is.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** That's very interesting. That was my impression, as well, that it's the wealthy elites in Russia that would be the real danger to Putin's rule, right?

**The Saker:** Absolutely, yes. They're an extreme danger for him. Last year, I think, one observer said that he thinks – I have my own little label for these people. I call the people who are supporting Putin the Eurasian Sovereignists. They want Russia to be sovereign and sort of become a Eurasian power. I call the pro-Western people the Atlantic Integrationists. These are people that want to integrate Russia into the Atlanticist Western security structures.

Well, one of the best observers – his name is Mikhail Chaiden – said last year that he thinks that just by 2016 they're about 50-50% in power. That tells us. After 16 years of Putin in power, he basically got at a 50-50%. That's quite amazing, considering that he has 80% of the people in the country. So you have a president that's supported by probably about half of the powerful people in the country only, about 80% of the people generally in the country, and who's still at extreme risk of a coup or operation against him, or just sabotage, which is probably the worst of all. Because they can't really remove him – he's too popular – but they're constantly

sabotaging everything he tries to make, everything. It's a well-known thing in Russia. He signs a decree and it's never implemented; it's just ignored.

And contrary to what the Western press says, he's not a dictator. He can't do like Stalin and just send cops to put a guy under arrest and shoot him in the basement. He has to follow the law. So for sabotage or bad work you can fire somebody, but if that person's well protected he will be re-hired. You can't just kidnap and shoot a person like that. You can try to find some kind of dirt to get on that person and then go after him. That's what happened with Khodorkovsky where they accused him of tax evasion. But it's really hard for him, that struggle. He's very isolated on the top there and he's taking a – every day it's a huge risk for him.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** You're talking about Putin being very isolated. Oh, wow.

**The Saker:** Well, now I would roughly say 50% of the people in the Kremlin and in the banks of the power structures are opposed to him. He has to deal with these people.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** It's interesting that Vladimir Putin has been so relentlessly demonized in the West, in the press and by the government and by Congress. Everybody's piling on, calling him names in the attack on him. And yet I recently read an article in the *Nexus* magazine – I wish I had it in front of me – written by someone who actually talked to certain people in the American government who had direct dealings with Putin at various times in the past, and they were all very – sort of off the record – very impressed with him, and talked about him being able to keep his word, and that he was ethical, and that you couldn't bribe him, etc. It was the polar opposite of the demonization. What is your impression of Putin as a person? Do you have any sense of it?

**The Saker:** I have a developing one. I'll surprise you. When he was appointed first, by the people around Yeltsin, I was very anti-

Putin. If you look at my early articles – I began my blog in 2007 – I was extremely suspicious of the man. The looks, the oversized suit he had, I don't know. I really was deeply suspicious that anything good could come out of a guy like that. And I completely changed my mind just by observing what he actually does. I think of him as one of the greatest Russian leaders ever in Russian history now. He achieved many number of miracles and he's dealing with an extraordinarily difficult situation.

My reading of him is, first of all, he's an extremely skilled and intelligent man. They usually say he was ex-KGB, but that overlooks something very important. In the Soviet Union, the KGB was a huge organization, which had a lot of different sub-groups, and he was part of the foreign intelligence service, the equivalent of the CIA, roughly. These are very different people. They were highly educated, knew the West superbly, and they had nothing to do with political repression, dissent, the gulag, all that stuff. He is not a torturer who stopped torturing people and became president. He's actually an intelligence specialist.

He clearly also is a person of immense personal courage. He's shown that several times. I think he's an officer, and by that I mean somebody who's deeply patriotic, and I think highly principled, yes. I can't prove it. I don't have evidence that he is not corruptible. I don't think he needs money because it's just not worth it. You can make a lot more money in Russia and be safe than sitting where he sits in the Kremlin, which is a very dangerous place to be. Traditionally, to be the Russian head of state is a dangerous place.

I think, everything I read on his actions, I am convinced that he's trying to do the best for the Russian people, and that's why I think the Russian people read it correctly, too, and support him against everything, including sanctions and real economic difficulties at a still 80% rate. These are not fake polls. The Western-paid polls and even the anti-Putin people actually accept

that, with disgust. They say the Russians are stupid and they call them “budla”, which means like trash, because they elected that guy, but they accept that, actually, he is really that popular.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** Yes, he strikes me as well as a very remarkable person. I hadn't really thought at length about what you're saying about how dangerous his position is, but I can see what you're saying, and that makes what he says and what he does even more remarkable. He really is very strong.

**The Saker:** He is amazingly strong, amazingly courageous, and he is very much at risk every day; political and even I would say physical risk, although the physical risk he dealt with first, and very effectively. He has basically put the right people now in command of the key power ministries and the key units that could attempt some kind of violent action against him, so that's not happening.

I don't think the US can overthrow him. The Russian security service is way too capable and it easily defeated it last time when there was this White Revolution and they alleged the elections were stolen, so that's not going to happen, either. So the real danger for Putin is very much that fifth column inside the power structures, which go as high as members of the government's ministries.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** You talked about Putin being very effective and very popular with his foreign policy but that there were big problems in Russia domestically with economic policy. What were you referring to?

**The Saker:** The fact that Russia's too heavily invested in the United States, corruption is still rampant, interest rates are too high, the ruble is floating. These are basically Washington consensus policies and not at all the kind of policies that Russia would need right now.

The blessing for Russia has been the economic sanctions, which forced Russia to diversify, not to rely only on quick buck made on energy sales. But that's not enough. What Russia needs is



to use that opportunity to diversify the economy, to invest into really making small businesses profitable and support the entrepreneur. That's not at all what's happening right now.

The system is corrupt. The courts are still corrupt, by the way. There is a lot of internal problems, unfortunately, and Putin's just ... He is trying. On a regular basis he intervenes personally, but he can't run around the entire country fixing the wrongs of everybody else who doesn't want to do it, and that's what he's doing, unfortunately.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** Exactly. So the Russian Federation is still very much economically under the thumb of the West, but they're looking to move out of the Western financial system, right? Are there active moves right now to set up their own – what do they call it – their own payment system, etc.?

**The Saker:** Yes, but only when forced to. You're right, for instance, the payment system they've been setting up. There have been other efforts because of the sanctions. But again, when you say “they,” I would say about half of them would like to and half of them would not like to.

There are a lot of Washington consensus, IMF, WTO types in Russia who are still pushing the kind of policies that are imposed upon every other country in the West, and a lot of people are saying it's a disaster – including a lot of Putin supporters. A lot of Putin supporters are at the same time very, very critical of the Medvedev governments and the economic policies of the governments.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** I've always found it amazing. I've never understood why so many of the Russians keep falling for the Western financial con. I mean, look what they've done to Russia.

**The Saker:** But the people who do that don't care about Russia. They care about their wallet. They want to rob Russia. These are the same people – you have to understand one thing

that's crucial. Putin did not appear at the end of the Soviet Union. He appeared at the end of the democracy of the Yeltsin regime. That's almost a decade of vicious, total plundering of Russia. There was no general purge when he came to power. There was somewhat of a purge of the worst oligarchs, so Berezovsky emigrated, Khodorkovsky was put in jail, some of them went to Israel, some of them basically decided to keep quiet and accept his deal of 'I won't touch you if you stop meddling in politics,' which was the best he could do with the instruments he had at the time.

And these people are still there and their children are still there, and it's an entire class. It's a class issue in a Marxist sense of the term. These people are defending their class interests, which are far more important to them than Russia or anything of international law or the people. They don't care about the people. These are people who are used to sucking the blood like a parasite of wherever they are, and in Russia we had a lot of them.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** It's interesting, because I keep meeting people socially who keep trying to claim that Putin was a Russian oligarch. He wasn't, was he?

**The Saker:** No, no, he wasn't. That is really laughable. That's kind of even silly, because if you are the president of Russia you don't need to be an oligarch. Essentially, he has limitless means, if you want, as a president, and even after he retires I can assure that he has no financial needs of any kind. This is actually silly to think that of somebody in his position.

What would be more interesting is, does he have a bunch of people around him who benefit from being around him *and* are oligarchs? I would say yes, to some degree that is more true. But there's a difference between a man who makes good money because of the position he's in but does not sabotage the country and the other guy, who does the same thing but at the same time he does that at the direct detriment of the country that he's hurting

with that.

So the oligarch in the Russian sense of the word is not only a rich person; he's a rich person who's meddling in politics with the deliberate desire to milk Russia for every possible ruble. I'm not aware of that kind of oligarchs in Russia right now. They're still making money, they're supporting the opposition to Putin, but generally they're not anywhere near the kind of power that a guy like Khodorkovsky was trying to achieve just before he fell from power.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** Saker, thank you very much.

**The Saker:** It has been a pleasure. Thank you so much to you. Again, it's a joy and an honor.

**Bonnie Faulkner:** I've been speaking with the Saker. Today's show has been "Trump and Putin: Setting the Record Straight." The Saker was born in a military family of white Russian refugees in western Europe where he lived most of his life. After completing two college degrees in the United States, he returned to Europe where he worked as a military analyst until he lost his career, due to his vocal opposition to the Western-sponsored wars in Chechnya, Croatia, Bosnia and Kosovo. After re-training as a software engineer, he returned to the United States where he now lives with his family. He has been blogging since 2007 as the Saker, and his essays have attracted a large audience. He is the author of *The Essential Saker: From the Trenches of the Emerging Multipolar World*. Visit [TheSaker.is](http://TheSaker.is). IS stands for Iceland.

Guns and Butter is produced by Bonnie Faulkner, Yarrow Mahko and Tony Rango. Visit us at [GunsAndButter.org](http://GunsAndButter.org) to listen to past programs, comment on shows, or join our email list to receive our newsletter that includes recent shows and updates. Email us at [Faulkner@gunsandbutter.org](mailto:Faulkner@gunsandbutter.org). Follow us on Twitter at [#gandbradio](https://twitter.com/gandbradio).



## Afterword by Cynthia McKinney

Well, as the sun sets on the horizon of our idyllic setting in an eco-resort full of palm and mango trees, my students have heard an earful from Catherine about the way the real economy works; she has also enhanced my understanding of how I must blend my political analysis with how the money works. And for my students, the treat is having Catherine and me together. And your treat is that you got Catherine, me, and The Saker! The Saker's book will become required reading for my students who are only just now joining a very important conversation about the future of our world. They are not only the inheritors of the world that we have made; they are also its creators for tomorrow. They are not naturally hateful of The Other: they are inquisitive. The Saker reaffirms that, despite the propaganda, we need not fear those whom we do not know. The Saker is such a rewarding reservoir of knowledge in the world's transformation, once again, to a multipolar world. The Saker reaffirms the track record of the United States in its long run with the world's unipolar movement and that a multipolar world is not something to fear, but is instead something to celebrate!

I found my way to *The Saker* because I wanted to cut through the omnipresent outright lies, deception, and propaganda that creates the fog of war. I have always been interested in Russia, "Security Studies," Russian literature, and U.S.–Russia relations. I even studied Russian history in high school! Therefore, I had some background that allowed me to organically understand that a disinformation wartime power play was in process. But where could I go to get objective analysis of what was happening? After all, U.S. Members of Congress were busy trying to convince the people of the U.S., including me, that Russia had militarily invaded

Crimea and illegally snatched it away from a democratic government in Ukraine. And I wasn't buying it. So, I let my computer clicks take me around the world in cyberspace in search of the truth. And I landed on the website of The Saker.

My ears perked up when the audio on my computer read aloud The Saker's words on Ukraine in one article: "The Moral Yardstick of the Ukrainian War." First, he takes on some Russians who refuse to acknowledge in their hearts the palpable Russophobia accompanying events in Ukraine. Then, he takes aim at American Leftists, who he correctly points out, refuse to deal honestly with the tragedy of September 11, 2001 because doing so would shatter their unsubstantiated belief in the goodness of the U.S. Deep State. The Saker observes so correctly that the U.S. Left is still a part of the system. This is exactly one of my complaints. Thirdly, The Saker concludes in this delicious morsel that exposes the duplicity of the Europeans: In Ukraine, Europeans hate Nazis who hate Jews, but accept the Nazis who hate Russians. Now, this goes directly to the arrogance of the U.S. Deep State and its propaganda meme of lies and deception; but we aren't supposed to notice that. In one fell swoop, The Saker had both my brain and my heart!

In the end, it boils down to the kind of world we want. I'm sick and tired of the lies; I'm sick and tired of the wars; I'm sick and tired of the divide and rule; I'm sick and tired of the hatred. I want a better world than the one we're allowing the psychopaths to create. Now, is our time. Now, is our time to act to create deep transformational change in the U.S. and to allow others to create change in their countries so that the world we give to our children (and to my students!) is one of which we are proud, because we, not the U.S. Deep State, made it.

Sadly, I must end this Afterword with a sense of urgency where *The Saker* begins. In “A Tale Of Two World Orders,” *The Saker* cites BRICS (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) and the SCO (Shanghai Cooperation Organization); two extremely important organizations that are trying to resuscitate a healthy world order with multipolarity while the U.S. Deep State is fighting mightily to prevent it. The U.S. Deep State is now moving to isolate, conquer, discredit, and otherwise neutralize the transformational and visionary leaders who conceived these organizations. Brazil’s former President Lula da Silva was accused of corruption while President Dilma Rouseff was successfully impeached for using the budget to help poor people in Brazil. The recent admission of both India and China to the SCO makes that organization even more of a powerhouse while providing a platform for the member states to peacefully iron out their political differences. The U.S. Deep State doesn’t like this as they are the enemy of peace. And as the peoples of this world come together in the positive type of globalization that my students spoke of with Catherine, the increasingly “irrelevant” (as *The Saker* characterizes the West) U.S. Deep State is lighting up the world in war. In fact, in my opinion, the world is already at war; World War III has already arrived: hot and kinetic in some places and cold and calculated in others. The potential for miscalculation or irrationality looms large. Thus, what is happening now all over the world is important to each and every one of us. The transformation to a multipolar world could come with a glorious end, but only at the end of an inglorious path. Why? Because it is this transformation to good, peace, and mutual respect that will be fought tooth and nail by those increasingly fewer people who get to enjoy the fruits of this unipolar movement. They will seek the delay of their inevitable irrelevance with every resource available to

them and don't shrink at the idea of us all being incinerated in war. Thus, get ready and stay tuned to The Saker. His wisdom is needed right now.







*"What society had done to me – made me completely powerless – it has also done to you. And just the way it had made me feel like a single lonely nutcase, it made you feel like you were the only one. I most sincerely believe that the real reason for the success of this blog, its global community, its vibrant discussions and the amazing outpouring of kindness towards me are in the following simple fact:*

*I inadvertently made it possible for many thousands of people to realize they were not alone, not crazy, not wrong but that quite literally "we are everywhere"!*

*The second thing that I did, again quite inadvertently, is to empower those who felt powerless to do something, to make a change, to really have an impact."*

From *Submarines in the Desert* – The Saker.

---

There has never been a time in history when mankind has stood in greater need of an accurate explanation and interpretation of the military, political, economic, strategic and even religious reality of the world, than the present rapidly-changing mysterious age in which we now live. Unless one understands and penetrates that reality, no one can possibly respond to it appropriately.

What I find most captivating about the Saker, is that he is blessed with an insight which accurately penetrates that reality, a versatile scholarship which binds all its different threads into a coherent whole, and a rare courage and intellectual integrity with which he fearlessly defies those who would seek, unjustly so, to silence him.

He correctly recognizes a post-Soviet Russia which is returning to its spiritual roots in Orthodox Christianity, as a major actor in contemporary affairs, and he anticipates a Russian tryst with destiny in a leadership role in confronting and eventually check-mating the relentless oppression of the arrogant people who control power in the western world.

Perhaps the most valuable insight of all that finds expression in these essays is Saker's view that a Muslim-Orthodox Christian reconciliation, friendship and alliance, despite six centuries of Ottoman oppression of the Orthodox Christian world, is both possible and likely to be realized. This is, of course, the oppressors' greatest nightmare.

Not only have I personally benefited from his writings, but I confidently predict that many thinking people around the world who yearn to understand contemporary reality, will also seek to benefit from his remarkable scholarship.

*Sheik Imram N Husein*