

J. M. D. De Vega<sup>1</sup>

## ON THE QUESTION OF THE GLOBAL BALANCE OF POWER, RUSSIA VS NATO AND THE DANGERS AND BANKRUPTCY OF UNIPOLARITY: IN DEFENSE OF MULTIPOLARITY

“If we, in a small point of the world map, are able to fulfill our duty and place at the disposal of this struggle whatever little of ourselves we are permitted to give: our lives, our sacrifice, and if some day we have to breathe our last breath on any land, already ours, sprinkled with our blood let it be known that we have measured the scope of our actions and that we only consider ourselves elements in the great army of the proletariat but that we are proud of having learned from the Cuban Revolution, and from its maximum leader, the great lesson emanating from his attitude in this part of the world: ‘What do the dangers or the sacrifices of a man or of a nation matter, when the destiny of humanity is at stake.’”

Our every action is a battle cry against imperialism, and a battle hymn for the people's unity against the great enemy of mankind: the United States of America. Wherever death may surprise us, let it be welcome, provided that this, our battle cry, may have reached some receptive ear and another hand may be extended to wield our weapons and other men be ready to intone the funeral dirge with the staccato singing of the machine-guns and new battle cries of war and victory.”

This was written by Che Guevara in his “Message to the Tricontinental”.<sup>2</sup>

Exactly a decade ago, I wrote the following remarkable words:

“It's bedazzling that the person that was largely portrayed as the ‘bad guy’ turns out to be the ‘good one’ who stopped, in an undeniable sense, the possible eruption of World War III.

How can we explain the irony of a former FSB director who successfully denied before the international community a so-called Nobel Prize winner from striking Syria with military might? Not only did the Russian president shame and smash, before the bar of global public opinion, the American president, on the question of the impropriety and inappropriateness of bombing Syria; the former has also shown, in a clear and comprehensive manner, what the world has already known a long time ago, and that is the irrefutable fact that America is not what it says it is to the planet.”<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Professor at the Philosophy and Humanities Department of the College of Arts, Education and Sciences of the National University of the Philippines (Manila), Ph. D., Master of Philosophy. His academic interests include international relations, law-making and law enforcement, democracy and human rights. Author of numerous publications, including articles “The Philippines and Russia: on Independent Foreign Policy”, “The World Must Come Together to Stand with Palestinian People”, “Historical Distortionism is the Destruction of the Nation's Foundation”, “China's Conquest of the South China Sea is the End of the International Rules-Based Order”, “In Solidarity to the Brave People of Sibuyan Island”, etc.; books “Dissidente” (2013), “Insurrecto” (2017), etc. Author of “Jose Mario De Vega” YouTube channel.

<sup>2</sup> See: Che Guevara Internet Archive. April 16, 1967. URL: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/guevara/1967/04/16.htm> (accessed: 16.05.2023).

<sup>3</sup> See: Putin and Obama: A comparison of the dove and the hawk // GMA News. 2013. Oct 5. URL: <https://www.gmanetwork.com/news/opinion/content/329563/putin-and-obama-a-comparison-of-the-dove-and-the-hawk/story/> (accessed: 16.05.2023).

This was period when the US and their allies are again preparing themselves to strike Syria and same with what they did with Libya conduct a regime change in that part of the world for their hegemonic and geopolitical interests.

It seems to me that the Russians and their allies have learnt from their previous mistake that is not intervening militarily in Libya. Hence, on the issue of Syria, the Russians did not only flex their muscles but registered in a firm manner that are back to their world position and they intend to stay.

I will argue that this is precisely what the world needs. A strong, determined and active Russia that will serve as a Global Balance of Power. Perhaps, the critics will say that this is a new form or the latest type of the Cold War, but be that as it may and no matter how controversial it is, it is the ardent contention of this representation that no one on their right and reasonable mind can deny the big and significant role that the Russians are playing in maintaining the peace and balance of power in the world stage as a whole. For instance, if the Russians did not lift their finger on Syria, what will happen to Damascus?

We could only imagine, but we have tons of evidence by virtue of the recent and the historical monstrosities committed by the US and the West to those nations and peoples that they ravaged of what might happen to Syria. For a specific example, look at Libya before and after it was attacked and destroyed by NATO<sup>4</sup> in this picture:

Same with Libya, what will happen to those millions of Syrian refugees? Where will they go? Where or which “good” and “civilized” countries will accept them?

According to a TeleSUR news report:

“Nine years after the military intervention, led by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to overthrow Colonel Muammar al-Gaddafi, Libya remains trapped in a spiral of violence involving armed groups, sectarian, ethnic groups and external interference that have led the country into absolute chaos.

On Oct. 20, 2011, amid protests supported by the governments of the United States and the European Union, an armed uprising that plunged the country into a civil war, the Libyan leader was captured and brutally murdered by the rebels.

Being one of the most prosperous countries in the African continent, thanks to its vast oil fields, after the fall of Gaddafi, the North African country was divided between rival governments in the east and west, and among multiple armed groups competing for quotas of power, control of the country and its wealth.

Gaddafi ruled for 42 years, leading Libya to a significant advance in social, political and economic matters that were recognized and admired by many African and Arab nations at the time. Despite his controversial government, Gaddafi came to represent an important figure for anti-imperialist struggles for his position mainly against the U. S.

<sup>4</sup> See: <https://www.pinterest.ph/pin/375980268869252716/> (accessed: 16.05.2023).

and the policies carried out from Washington on the Middle East.”<sup>1</sup>

### **The Dangers and Bankruptcy of Unipolarity**

It would utterly be dangerous, myopic and a pity for the world if we will allow only the control and direction of the global system in the hands of the US, UK, the West and NATO. The world has already seen their decadence and moral bankruptcy since the middle part of the 20th century. It would completely idiotic for the people of the world to allow them to determine for us all the global norms and alleged international rules-based order which in truth and in fact is nothing more their imperial hegemony based on their vision of Unipolarity ranging from global politics and economics, their one-sided culture, sports, entertainments and almost all aspects and domains of our existence.

### **Hegemony, US Imperialism and the Rise of Unipolarity**

After World War II, the world is composed of three powerful blocs, namely, The US, the Soviet Union and the nations who recently had their independence known as the Non-Aligned Movement. Though non-aligned, more often than not these countries sided with Russia on socio-economic issues.

From 1989 to 1991 a series of world events had happened that grievously led to fall of the Berlin Wall and consequently to the disintegration of the former Soviet Union. Is it this period that we could say that the US which remain as the sole superpower begun their “unipolar moment”.

As a remaining superpower that gave the US establishment the messianic view that they have the right to further control and shape the world through their liking. Hence, they projected their dominance and power not only via their brand of economics buy by force. They attacked and bombed Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Iraq, Yemen, Libya, etc.

They thought that they will forever rule the world and be the permanent Globo-cop. This kind of dangerous and myopic thinking is totally against the principles of the dialectics of history.

The new millennium brought new power players in the world, albeit they are independent. We saw the rise of India, China and the revival of Russia.

Today, the only news we can hear from the US and their allies is the alleged danger of Russia and China and India’s questionable neutrality.

### **The Beginning of the End of Unipolarity**

We could trace the event and say that the global financial crisis of 2007–2008 is its starting-point. Then, the election into office of Donald Trump in 2016 hasten its negation and finally the humiliating withdrawal of the US in Iraq and Afghanistan which is comparable to their equally humiliating withdrawal in Saigon and defeat in the Vietnam War in 1975.

All of these are undeniable ingredients to show the dying empire of Pax Americana, yet there are two momentous historical events that connected to Russia in relation to this discussion that I would like to highlight.

<sup>1</sup> See: Libya Before and After Muammar Gaddafi. 2020. Jan. 15. URL: <https://www.telesurenghish.net/analysis/Libya-Before-and-After-Muammar-Gaddafi-20200115-0011.html> (accessed: 16.05.2023).

First, after the Americans succeeded in their sponsored coup that toppled the duly elected president of Ukraine in 2014, they cannot do anything to Russia when it counterattacked by annexing Crimea.

Second and much more important in my view, in 2015, the Americans were checked in Syria when the Russians send their military there to stop and defeat the US forces in their aim of regime change.

These twin events had shown to the whole world that the US as a power is declining and Russia is not only rejuvenated, but perhaps has already attained its former position prior to the collapse of the Soviet Union. Though, I largely attribute these successes to the whole Russian people, yet we cannot deny the role on an individual in history. Undeniably, President Vladimir Putin has played not only a key and crucial role, but indeed a decisive leadership.

### **The Russian Federation Today**

In order for us to fully understand Russia today, we have to go back to its contemporary history. In 1991 after the collapse of the former Soviet Union and the breakup of its satellites, Russia suffered hardship and tremendous political and economic crisis. In the psychological level it has some grave effect, not only to its leaders but indeed to the Russian people. Sad but true, but by virtue of these set-backs, upset and apparent defeat, they felt that they lost a great amount of power and influence in the world. Their prestige was shaken and it seems that they are no longer a Super Power.

Added insult to injury, Russia could not even react when NATO attacked and bombed Yugoslavia even if the same was not permitted nor sanction by the Security Council of the UN. What added to the Russian’s anger and disgust is the fact that they were not even consulted on the matter. The Russians will never ever forget nor forgive this disrespectful and utterly shameful act of the US and its allies in NATO.

This event is truly painful and a shame to the Russians’ pride and character, because what the NATO forces are bombing is considered by Kremlin as their backyard and indeed, a part of their sphere of influence. Nonetheless, because the Russians at that time are not in the position to complain or to protest, they reluctantly swallow this slight.

Indeed, as natural visionaries and innate survivors, what the Russians did is to bid their time and instead they worked tirelessly to restore and strengthen their economy, various institutions and put an order and stability to their political system. Thereupon, after merely two decades, they have successfully attained their economic power and recover much of their status as a global player and indeed, a Super Power.

### **NATO’s Eastward Expansion and Western Treachery to the Agreement**

It is important to stress and revisit the story and the history with regard to this crucial issue of NATO’s expansion, because the said question has a direct link to the on-going military confrontation raging now in Europe.

The problem, as always is that there exist two opposing and conflicting narratives.<sup>2</sup> On Russia’s side they main-

<sup>2</sup> For the context of the two different narratives, see: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nVt-WXtLIZM>; Did NATO promise Russia never to expand to the east? // DW News. 2022. March 19. See also: *Bognot H. M., De Vega J. M. D., Pepa R. F.* Pravda: Ang Digmaang Proxy sa Ukraina:

tained all throughout that they already reached a mutual understanding and an Agreement with the West, albeit it is not written; but years later, the West will state that there is no understanding nor an agreement whatsoever on this matter.

Same with the issue of the former Yugoslavia, this traitorous and dishonorable manner of the US and its allies in not honoring an agreement is also something that the Russians will not forget nor forgive.

For truth and in fact, to the Russians, they agreed to dissolve the *Warsaw Pact* and they even give their concurrence for the reunification of the divided Germany, but the US and its allies in NATO must promised that they will no longer proceed or that they will cease from their eastward expansion, because Russia considered the same as its boundary.

According to Professor Stephen F. Cohen<sup>1</sup> in his lecture at the Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs with the title: “Soviet Fates and Lost Alternatives: From Stalinism to the New Cold War” delivered on May 19, 2010:

NATO expansion represents the following to Russia: It represents a profoundly broken promise to Russia, made by the first Bush, that in return for a united Germany in NATO, NATO would not expand eastward. This is beyond any dispute.

People say they never signed a treaty. But a deal is a deal. If the United States gives its word – unless we’re shysters, and if you don’t get it in writing, we’ll cheat you – we broke our word. When both Putin and Medvedev say publicly, to Madeleine Albright and others, “We, Russia, feel deceived and betrayed,” that’s what they are talking about.

So, NATO represents on the part of Russia a lack of trust: You break your words to us. To what extent can we trust you?

Secondly, it represents military encirclement. If you sit in the Kremlin and you look out at where NATO is and where they want to go, it’s everywhere. It’s everywhere on Russia’s borders.

But there’s something even more profound that is a taboo in the United States. NATO expansion represents for the Russians American hypocrisy and a dual standard. They see it this way, and I can’t think of any way to deny their argument.

The expansion of NATO is the expansion of the American sphere of influence, plain and simple. Where NATO goes, our military force goes. Where NATO goes, our arms munitions go, because they have to buy American weapons. Where NATO goes, Western soldiers go, who date their women, who bring along their habits, and all the other things. It’s clearly, undebatably, indisputably an expansion of America’s sphere of influence.

So there has been a tremendous expansion of America’s sphere of influence since the mid-1990s, right plunk on Russia’s borders, with all the while, every American administration saying to Russia, including the Obama Administration, “You cannot have a sphere of influence because that’s old thinking.”

Rusya Laban sa NATO / patnugot R. A. Macawili. Paranague, Philippine : The Radical Press, 2022, specifically the Foreword of Professor Ramon G. Guillermo of the Center for International Studies, University of the Philippines (p. iii–vi).

<sup>1</sup> Stephen Frand Cohen (1938–2020), Professor Emeritus of New York University and Princeton University.

The Russians may be cruel, but they’re not stupid. In other words, what they say [America is saying] is, “We can now have the biggest sphere of influence the world has ever seen, and you don’t get any, not even on your own border. In fact, we’re taking what used to be your traditional sphere of influence, along with the energy and all the rest. It’s ours now” – again, this idea of a winner-take-all policy.

*This is the enormous resentment in Russia. The relationship will never become a stable, cooperative relationship until we deal with this problem.*

Does it mean Russia is entitled to a sphere of influence? I don’t want to think for Jack Matlock, but Jack thinks yes, depending on what you mean by “sphere of influence”. They can’t occupy countries. We had a Monroe Doctrine. But the point is that until this is worked out, the relationship will never truly be post-Cold War.

The problem is, it’s taboo in America to talk about this issue of who has a sphere of influence, who is entitled to it. I think there are solutions, but you can’t even get the question asked. If you can’t get the question on the agenda, you obviously can’t come up with an answer.<sup>2</sup>

There is no iota of doubt that what the US, the West and NATO did to Russia is not only a breach of trust and contract, but unpardonable betrayal of the worst kind. Not only did the West did not honor their promise and commitment, worst, as if irritating Russia, the former US President Bill Clinton in 1996 openly called those nations who were former members of the defunct Warsaw pact to join NATO. Then, three years later, Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic has joined.

If this is not a slap to Russia, then I do not know what it is.

While this membership spree is in full blast, there are also tensions, ripples and fierce debate happening inside NATO plus the continuous warning and consistent protestations being made by Russia. Then, the next round of the new possible members to NATO was when seven countries from the Central and Eastern part of Europe, namely: Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, at Slovenia manifested their intention to join. Take note that these countries were traditionally and historically considered by Russia as part of its sphere of influence. They were formally invited to join at the Prague Summit in 2002. Their membership was formally accepted in 2004 at Istanbul.

NATO, it seems is not content with its new members and it wants some more. Hence, it continued its massive recruitment. Then, on April 1, 2009, Albania and Croatia, joined it that is before the Summit of 2009 at Strasbourg–Kehl. Then, it was followed by Montenegro which joined on June 5, 2017 and North Macedonia on March 27, 2020. According to the report<sup>3</sup>, NATO’s latest member was Finland which joined on April 4, 2023. The report further stated that the “Nordic country is the 31st member of the defense alliance.” Again, let us take note that Finland historically is always been part of the Russian empire and one of Russia’s provinces with semi-autonomous status. It must be

<sup>2</sup> For the complete video of the lecture, see: <https://www.carnegiecouncil.org/studio/multimedia/20100519-soviet-fates-and-lost-alternatives-from-stalinism-to-the-new-cold-war>.

<sup>3</sup> Bayer L. Finland is now officially a NATO member // Politico. 2023. Apr. 4. URL: <https://www.politico.eu/article/finland-officially-nato-alliance-member-jens-stoltenberg-pekka-haavisto-antony-blinken/> (accessed: 16.05.2023).

asked categorically: is the decision of the Finnish government beneficial to the Finnish people?

It must be further noted that now that Finland is officially a NATO member, another Nordic country that is so eager to join is Sweden. We must ask the material question: does both Finland and Sweden understand the grave and dangerous implication of their decision and intention?

For a better analysis on this matter, let me quote the international commentator Jan Oberg:<sup>1</sup>

*“The Swedes and the Finns will become less secure. Why? Because there will be harder confrontation and polarization instead of soft borders and mediating attitudes. In a serious crisis, they will, for all practical purposes, be occupied and told what to do by the U. S. / NATO.*

To the degree that, at some point in the future, the two countries will be asked to host U. S. bases – like Norway and Denmark now – they won’t be able to say ‘No!’ Such bases will be Russia’s first-order targets in a war situation.

*From a Russian point of view, of course, their NATO membership is extremely tension-increasing and confrontational.* Russia has 8 percent (\$66 billion) of the military expenditures of the 30 NATO members. Now there will be a huge re-armament throughout NATO. Germany alone plans to increase to almost twice as much as Russia’s expenditures. Ukraine will receive about \$50 billion. Add a re-armed Sweden and Finland and we shall see Russia rush down to 4 percent of NATO’s expenditures – and still be called a formidable threat.

*There will be virtually no confidence-building and conflict-resolution mechanisms left in Europe.* No discussion will be possible about a new all-European peace and security system. And whether it is understood and respected or not, Russia will feel even more intimidated, isolated and – in a certain situation – become even more desperate. As does, normally, the weaker party in an a-symmetric conflict. We are living in very dangerous times and these two countries in NATO will only increase the danger, there is no way it could reduce it.

If Finland and Sweden so strongly want to be ‘protected’ by the United States and/or NATO, it is completely unnecessary for these two countries to join because, if there is a serious crisis, *the U. S. / NATO will under all circumstances come to ‘protect’ or rather use their territories to be closer to the Baltic republics. That’s what the Host Nation Support agreements are about.*

The only reason to join would be paragraph 5 – but the disadvantage is that *paragraph 5 requires that Finland and Sweden will be expected to participate in wars that are not about their defense and perhaps even in future international law-violating wars à la those in Yugoslavia, Iraq and Libya.* So, will Finnish and Swedish young people be killed in future NATO-country wars? Are they ready for that?

It will cost a fortune to convert their military infrastructure to full NATO membership – and when they have joined, *they will pay whatever the price will turn out to be.* In addition, there will be much less de facto sovereign decision-making possible – here de jure is almost irrelevant. And it was already very self-limited before they joined.

*As NATO members, Finland and Sweden cannot but share the responsibility for nuclear weapons* – the deterrence and possible use of them by NATO. It’s also obvious

<sup>1</sup> He is an internationally experienced, independent peace and future researcher and an art photographer, columnist, commentator and mediator.

that NATO vessels may bring nuclear weapons into their ports – but they will of course not even ask – they know the arrogant U. S. response is that ‘we neither confirm nor deny that sort of thing.’

*This goes against every fibre of the Swedish people* – and Sweden’s decision to not develop nuclear weapons dating some 70 years back.

*The days when Sweden and Finland can – in principle, at least – work for alternatives are numbered.* That is, for the U. N. treaty on nuclear abolition and the U. N. goals of general and complete disarmament, any alternative policy concepts like common security, human security, a strong U. N. etc. They won’t be able to serve as mediators – like, say, Austria and Switzerland. No NATO member can pay anything but lip service to such noble goals. NATO is not an organization that encourages alternatives. Instead, it seeks monopoly as well as regional and global dominance.

Finland and Sweden say yes to militarist thinking, to a ‘peace’ paradigm that is imbued with weapons, armament, offensiveness (long-range + large destructive capacity), deterrence and constant threatening: NATO is human history’s most militaristic organization. *Its leader, the United States of America, has been at war 225 out of 243 years since 1776.* Every idea about nonviolence, the U. N. Charter provision of making peace by predominantly peaceful means (Article 1 in the Charter) will be out of the window.

*The political attention, as well as funds, will tend to switch to military matters, away from contributing to solving humanity’s most urgent problems.* But – we know it now – the excuse will be Putin’s invasion of Ukraine. Is there any huge change that cannot be justified with reference to that?

While everybody knows that the Arctic is going to be a region of central security and peace concerns in the near future, this issue has hardly been discussed in relation to the two countries’ NATO membership. However, *it doesn’t require much expertise to see that U. S. / NATO access to Sweden and Finland is a clear advantage in the future confrontation with Russia and China there.*

*As NATO members, Sweden and Finland not only accept but reinforce decades of hate of the Russian people, everything Russia including Russian-European culture.* It will say yes to the West’s reckless, knee-jerk collective (illegal) punishment of everything Russia, the cancellation of Russia on all dimensions.<sup>22</sup>

It must be stressed again and again that in all these maneuvers and sinister moves by NATO, Russia has repeatedly and consistently registered in a strong tone their grievance and concerns with regard to their security.

As reported, Kremlin spokesman Dmitry Peskov “separately told reporters that Finland’s accession to NATO was forcing Moscow to take countermeasures to ensure its security. On Monday, Russia promised to strengthen military capacity in its western and northwestern regions in response to NATO’s expansion.”<sup>23</sup>

<sup>22</sup> See: *Oberg J.* Ukraine: Foolish for Finland & Sweden to Join NATO // Scheerpost. 2022. May 16. URL: <https://scheerpost.com/2022/05/16/ukraine-foolish-for-finland-sweden-to-join-nato> (accessed: 16.05.2023). Emphases are mine.

<sup>23</sup> See: *Kennedy M., Martinez A.* Finland joins NATO over Russia’s objection // NPR. 2023. Apr. 4. URL: <https://www.npr.org/2023/04/04/1167881009/finland-is-about-to-join-nato-prompted-by-russias-invasion-of-ukraine> (accessed: 16.05.2023).

### **Russia is fed up with the West's Hypocrisy and Deafness: the 2008 Russia-Georgian War**

In 2008, because in the view of Russia NATO is not listening and still thought that the former is the same country of the 1990's, and that its threats are mere words, they have the shock of their lives when war broke between Russia and Georgia. The idiots in Brussels can't believe that Russia will flex its muscles. Said "war" lasted for barely five days and with Russian's victory they recognized the Independence of Abkhazia and South Ossetia.

Let it be noted that this conflict happened in 2008, when the US is suffering from a global financial crisis. I believe that this bold act of the Russians did not only serves a material warning to the West and their allies, but they also prevented NATO from further expanding to their very gates.

### **The Ukrainian Coup of 2014 and the Russian Annexation of Crimea**

We all know the financiers and the powers that be behind the 2014 Ukrainian coup.<sup>1</sup> The Russian countermove is a masterstroke to say the least. They annexed Crimea not merely to gain a territory but for purposes of defending their country's security.

The critics and the idiots can argue whatever sides or scripts they want, but the truth is: the culprit in this whole matter is no other than the United States of America and the Nazi forces in Kiev headed by their comedian.

Too reiterate the central point: the Russians has been repeatedly and consistently aired their misgivings, concerns and warning to NATO that the ball stops in Ukraine. In a word: not another inch. Because for the Russian, Ukraine is the red line.

In their minds, the incorporation of the former Eastern Blocs and post-Soviet states to the NATO alliance is the central reason, if not the principal root cause of the tensions and conflict between Russia and the West. And then, the continuous provocation of the West while using Ukraine and this idiot's willingness to become a tool or a pawn has led Russia to no other option but to launch their "special military operation" on February 24th, of last year to protect its sovereignty, interest and security.

A couple of days prior to the launching of the "special military action", president Putin has first recognized formally the Independence of Lugansk and Donetsk in the Donbas region which has been fighting Kiev for the last eight (8) years while also asking for formal recognition and protection of the Russian Federation.

### **The ignorance, stupidity and idiotic fanatical veneration of Zelensky to the US, UK, the West and NATO**

Not that I am belittling the skills and ability of the Ukrainian President, by virtue of the amusing fact of his being a former comedian, but I cannot explain what kind of thinking or mental mechanism he has. Does it never occur to his thought that their neighbor, in a metaphorical sense is a gorilla or a bear? Is it logical to irritate and mess with the giant?<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See: Putin berates US and EU envoys, top official says US aid fueling Ukraine war's 'hot phase' // Reuters. 2023. Apr. 6. URL: <https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/putin-berates-us-eu-ambassadors-kremlin-ceremony-2023-04-05> (accessed: 16.05.2023).

<sup>2</sup> See: Professor John Mearsheimer's lecture on Russia-Ukraine War & Who is responsible? URL: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rMzZ\\_IVH\\_A&t=220s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rMzZ_IVH_A&t=220s) (accessed: 16.05.2023).

If this freak is a realist and possessed a deep understanding of history, aware and a sense of geopolitics and even the basic rule of international relations among nations, both logic and pragmatism will tell him that the right thing to do is to be civil and diplomatic in dealing with Russia. Unfortunately, due to his naiveté and unexplainable idiocy, what he did is totally against all sense and reason: he allowed himself actively and his poor country to be used by NATO under the leadership of the US to become a tool in trying to ferment and weaken Russia.

I overwhelmingly concur with the insightful and penetrative analysis<sup>3</sup> of Ms. Palki Sharma Upadhyay of Wion International News. According to this brilliant woman, Zelensky is guilty of three (3) miscalculations:

*First*, He overestimated Western Support,

*Second*, Misread Ukraine's Importance to the West, and

*Third*, Misread Putin's Intent to Invade.

Incontestably, in all the three miscalculations, Zelensky got it all badly wrong. In the first, it clearly has shown that this guy has no sense of history of global imperialism. It seems to me that he is so dumb and utterly stupid to believe the sweet talk of NATO and to bank wholeheartedly to the US that it completely escaped his sanity. Does he truly and really believe that when the tough gets going and the going gets tough, the US and its allies will fight for them?

For the benefit of the reader, let us go back to the horrible and humiliating experience suffered by the former Czechoslovakia and later of Poland during World War II with regard to this issue. Did the West come to their rescue when Hitler invaded them?

In the second, he wrongfully thought that Ukraine so important and valuable to the West, yet he failed miserably to anticipate that his country's importance is merely to use their land and their people by the US and NATO as a killing field or a battle arena. The sad truth is that their importance is nothing more than but to become a war zone.

The policy of the US is to continue the war up to the last Ukrainian.<sup>4</sup>

In the third, I would say unhesitatingly that this is idiocy of the worst order ever. Before the actual attack in February of last year, the Russian military has been in months engaged in drills? And mobilization at the border. Does it not even enter the mind of this clown: will Russia brought its military there for nothing and that the Russians will not do anything?

I wonder, is he aware that a war broke out in 2008? Did he not learn of the Russian annexation of Crimea in 2014? Is he unaware of Russia's continuous warning to the West with regard to its provocation using Ukraine?

Ms. Palki Sharma is absolutely correct and on point. This freak is not only a novice, but indubitably knows nothing at all. In allowing himself to be used, it is his country and people that paid the heavy price. Due to the war, a great portion of the country is now in ruins and millions

<sup>3</sup> See: Wion, Gravitas: "Zelensky's three big miscalculations." URL: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O1-uRaAbjUM> (accessed: 16.05.2023).

<sup>4</sup> See: *Bandow D.* Washington Will Fight Russia to the Last Ukrainian // The Cato Institute. 2022. Apr. 14. URL: <https://www.cato.org/commentary/washington-will-fight-russia-last-ukrainian>; *Polychroniou C. J.* Chomsky: A Stronger NATO Is the Last Thing We Need as Russia-Ukraine War Turns 1 // Truthout. 2023. Febr. 23. URL: <https://truthout.org/articles/chomsky-a-stronger-nato-is-the-last-thing-we-need-as-russia-ukraine-war-turns-1> (accessed: 16.05.2023).

of his people are now refugees. All for what? For that rubbish membership of EU and NATO?

Question: Is it worth it?

### **Besides Zelensky, the US, UK, EU and NATO are responsible for the destruction of Ukraine**

In our book, “Pravda Ang Digmaang Proxy sa Ukraina: Rusya Laban sa NATO” (“Pravda The Proxy War in Ukraina: Russia versus NATO”), I stated then my proposals and the following solutions to the on-going war:<sup>1</sup>

1. There is to scintilla of doubt that the Western world, have no choice whatsoever but to recognize the presence and necessary existence of Russia and its primordial role as the maintainer of the Global Balance of Power in a Multipolar World Order.

The proponent of the dying Unipolar world must respect *the sphere of influence* of the Russians and their allies. If the Americans have their so-called Global Monroe Doctrine, wherein the US will never allow the presence of foreign forces and installation of military bases, worst of nuclear missiles in their so-called “backyard” which is the Western Hemisphere, as if they owned the whole of Latin Amerika; then why can’t they also respect the Russian’s demand to not put any foreign forces and install any military bases and nuclear missiles to its border?

Specific and direct question to the Americans: if it’s okay to put missiles to Russia’s border, is it also okay for the Russians to set up military bases and install nuclear missiles, let’s say in Cuba, Mexico or perhaps Venezuela?

Or they want a repeat of the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis which they are aggressively provoking in Ukraine?

2. NATO must stop immediately their Eastern Expansion. This I the number one irritation and disgust by Russia to the West. Why can’t they deal with their own affairs and cease messing with Russia? To reiterate, NATO’s latest action, accepting to its fold Finland’s membership and considering Sweden’s bid are anti-peace acts that will further anger Russia. No one can blame Russia if they will bolster their defense at the Finnish border in order to safeguard their territorial integrity, security and sovereignty.

3. It is about time that the people of the whole world must call for the dissolution of NATO. We have asked the question and highlight the fact: what is the purpose of this military alliance? Isn’t it a fact as they say that communism is already dead long time ago?

Russia is no longer a communist state. Hence, if that is the case, then this so-called alliance is render useless by history.

Perhaps, in order for this so-called alliance to have a certain degree of consistency and “relevance”, the right thing to do for them is to change their name, for example: *The Anti-Russia Alliance* or *Nations of Putin Haters* or perhaps, *The Contra Russia et al bloc*.

I fully concur with the Statement issued by Stop the War Coalition:

“Stop the War opposes any war over Ukraine, and believes the crisis should be settled on a basis which recognizes the right of the Ukrainian people to self-determination and addresses Russia’s security concerns.”<sup>2</sup>

4. Ukraine must be a neutral state (perhaps like the status of Switzerland or India) in order for it to serve as a buffer zone of Russia as against the so-called “democratic countries” who wishes to weaken it.

5. The need to demilitarized Ukraine and to denazify its fascist elements.

6. Ukraine must recognize the legitimate demand and aspiration of the peoples of the Donbas region and status of Crimea.

7. To continue the peace talks and review the provision, protocols and implementation of the Minsk Agreements.

### **The Price of Peace in Ukraine**

That was a year ago and I still maintain the appropriateness of those proposals, except that I would like to highlight the fact that if Ukraine wants peace, then what we need is not merely a Minsk Agreement, but *a political negotiates settlement*. Meaning, it is a *Peace Treaty* between Russia and Ukraine wherein the latter must accept that due to its short-sightedness and narrowmindedness, it can no longer expect a Ukraine with the same size that it’s has prior to the commencement of the conflict. That is the heavy price that it needs to pay.

### **What’s needed to have a world at peace?**

To the US particular and NATO in general: they have to fuckoff from Russia’s border and stop from messing with other countries’ life and destiny.

*They have to accept that their imperial vision of a unipolar world is dead and that the future of humanity is Multipolarity.*

<sup>1</sup> Written in the Filipino language by Filipino academics to explain the Proxy War in Ukraine under the behest and leadership of the US and NATO against Russia in direct opposition and clear contrast to the prevailing script and the dominant narrative of the capitalist corporate Western media which says that everything is the mistake and fault of Russia. This is the first book of its kind. It is a work that defends Russia from slander, misinformation, disinformation, distortion, black propaganda, etc. Published by the Radical Press, May–June 2022 with contributions by Professor Herman M. Bognot, Professor Jose Mario D. De Vega, Professor Ruel F. Pepa, edited by Professor Ronald A. Macawili. See specifically the paper of this writer, “Ang Rusya sa harap ng mga Imperyalista sa Kasaysayan, Ang Mapanganib at Bangkaroteng Midya ng Narratibong Unipolar ng Kanluran at Papel ng Rusya sa Kontemporaryong Panahon” (“Russia in Confrontation with the Imperialists Throughout History, The Bankrupt Media and the Dangerous Narrative of Western Unipolarity and the Role of Russia in Our Contemporary Epoch”), pages 92–163.

<sup>2</sup> See: List of Signatories: Stop the War Statement on the Crisis Over Ukraine // Stop the War Coalition : [website]. 2022. Febr. 18. URL: <https://www.stopwar.org.uk/article/list-of-signatories-stop-the-war-statement-on-the-crisis-over-ukraine> (accessed: 16.05.2023).