

NATO's Interference in the Ukrainian-Russian War: International political considerations

by Bela Pokol

1) Today's problem of Europe began with the continuation of NATO, which became dysfunctional in 1990.

NATO, established against the Soviet empire, became an instrument of the American monopoly world power with the disappearance of the adversary and the absence of a counterpole. It was then given a role only every few years, but at least it determined the drama of European destiny for a few years.

1) In 1999, the Yugoslav invasion, which German MEP *Hermann Scheer* called a war crime in a Bundestag debate, created a situation that has deteriorated ever since, instead of creating a more peaceful situation in the Balkans; it brought Germany's and France's industrial development work there to a halt and turned much of the region into a hotbed of strife fomented by U.S. global NGO networks, most notably George Soros.

2) In 2003, it overthrew the Iraqi regime, which had contained the Sunni-Shiite conflict with an iron fist, under the deliberately false pretext of Saddam's weapons of mass destruction, causing the deep-rooted Sunni-Shiite conflict in the region to erupt in several states and killing hundreds of thousands of people since then. Last but not least, the Sunni officers of Saddam's vast army became the main axis of militant Islam, which founded the Islamic State, set the entire Arab region on fire, and radicalized the young Muslims who settled in Europe. Hundreds of people have already been killed in various stabbings, bombings and car bombings in major Western European cities.

3) In 2011, the internal rebels of the Gaddafi regime provided the pretext for NATO's invasion of Libya, and the regime, which had stood in the way of millions of Africans and which had made agreements with Europe to perform this migration detention function for hundreds of thousands of black Africans, was overthrown. Since then, the Libyan dam burst, combined with the aftermath of NATO's 2003 attack on Iraq, has triggered mass migration, and since 2015, millions of Islamic migrants have occasionally poured into Europe, including thousands of Islamists.

4) This Islamist infiltration of Europe, fomented from the south, has been continued by NATO from the east, and U.S. globalist groups, increasingly using NATO as a front, have sought to take over the weakened remnants of the crumbling Soviet empire. As early as 1991, the still vast Russian and Ukrainian resources began to be controlled by local oligarchies, with the heads of the U.S. embassy and U.S. foreign service apparatus making deals with the Ukrainian oligarchs behind the backs of the alcoholic President Yeltsin in Russia and the

Ukrainian oligarchs who had direct control over Ukrainian state posts and state assets. In Russia, this stopped with Putin's assumption of power in 1999, and the U.S. NGO networks, media, and institutional intellectual power that had been built up were broken, but in Ukraine, to prevent this, a successful coup was carried out against the more Russian-oriented President Yanukovich in 2014. U.S. anti-Russian policy has continued its proxy war against the Russians by bringing the Ukrainians into NATO and equipping them with high-end weapons, and so the current Russian offensive against U.S.-led NATO forces fighting through the Ukrainians has come in several rounds. But the big threat is yet to come, as Russia, aside from the proxy threat, is becoming more open with the U.S. and NATO powers, declaring the lower end of its nuclear strike force, now described as "parceled out," ready for deployment. I do not know enough about it to assess to what extent it is equivalent to the known - the only known! - nuclear strike on Hiroshima or exceeds it.

And all because in 1991 we left NATO, which had become dysfunctional, to the globalist U.S., which has become the sole ruler of the world. If this leaves us without a nuclear strike, the first thing we should do is "disband" NATO and replace it with a truly defensive European military alliance. As the then French leadership proposed in 1991 with enthusiastic German support, only unfortunately after a few years of debate the US globalists won and the plan was abandoned (see Shake 1995). It was then that the present problem began in Europe, and it is the unfortunate Ukrainian people who are now drinking the juice.

2) The task of building the sovereign European position.

The new Ukrainian-Russian war, provoked at length by the United States, has brought to our attention a previously overlooked aspect of regime change in Central and Eastern Europe (Mearsheimer 2014). After the collapse of the Soviet empire, in the joy of liberation from it and in our desire in Eastern Europe to join the Western half of Europe, the fact that the NATO led by the Americans against the Soviet forces had lost its function with the collapse of the latter was not even mentioned in the debates of the domestic public in Hungary. However, this huge war machine, which had lost its function, simply sought new functions out of inertia, and the war machine, already strictly controlled and led by the U.S., became more and more a front for the U.S. to strike anywhere in the world for its own goals.

The French, who had left NATO in 1966, if not formally, then in fact, raised the idea in 1991 of replacing NATO, which had become functionless, with a separate military alliance for Europe to counter, among other things, the remaining nuclear power, Russia, but this did not resonate with the other Western European countries, which were steeped in the dominant U.S. globalists. However, when the U.S. attack on Yugoslavia in 1999 and then on Iraq in 2003 was carried out against the opposition of the Franco-German pair under the NATO flag - and in retrospect with precision bombing of French and German interests on Yugoslav territory - the demand of this pair of great powers for an independent European force to replace NATO was reinforced. Nothing came of it, and in 2009, our country's less than glorious French descendant, President Sárközy, even invited France back into NATO.

It was therefore gratifying to see that now one of the candidates for the French presidential elections, Ms. Le Pen, has included withdrawal from NATO in her program, and even if the opinion polls do not favor her victory, the European sovereign governments and their intellectual background should reflect on the importance of this agenda item. Especially since in 2016 the U.S. government made an about-face from a globalist to an isolationist position, which itself envisaged the dissolution of NATO. This was interrupted by President Trump's departure in 2020, but the growing strength of the Republicans he dominates in

Congress and his plans for reelection in 2024-whose chances are supported by current polls-make it necessary to think theoretically about abolishing NATO in Europe and to discuss this across Europe with the intellectual support of Le Pen's party.

This pan-European debate on leaving NATO would also be a good opportunity for sovereignist intellectual circles to discuss EU reform back to the Common Market in the coming years to break the EU's federalist tendencies. It is not necessary to leave the EU to eliminate its current anti-member state tendencies, because a united conservative coalition seeking a return to the Common Market could, with a majority in the EP, effectively scale it back to pure economic integration, which would be in all our interests.

Let's end the terrible war in our neighborhood as soon as possible, but let's at least use the experience of its creation to draw the conclusions to think about the long-planned independent European military alliance to replace the current NATO, which has been used as a cover by the U.S. globalists. The domestic conservative think tanks in Hungary, in cooperation with the French sovereignist and the U.S. isolationist-Trumpist political think tanks, should urgently reconsider the role of NATO and discuss the possibility of an independent European military alliance in its place.

3) Differences between the world power organization of the globalist and the isolationist U.S.

With the collapse of the Soviet empire, the U.S., which had become the sole world power, embarked on an intensive globalist expansionist course, and the negative consequences at home - the export of capital to low-wage countries and the resulting mass unemployment in the form of "Rust America" - led to a temporary break with it in 2016. President Trump began organizing the return of the isolationist U.S. under the slogan "America First," and although this was reversed by the end of his term, the actions and plans taken up to that point show the difference between the globalist U.S. and the world power organization of the isolationist U.S. that Trump has set as his goal.

The globalist U.S. has introduced an economy dominated by banking capital and other social sectors marketed at home, whose main drive is not to boost peak production at home but to make as much profit as possible anywhere in the world. The U.S. state, in this logic, is only important to the banking/investment groups that dominate the world as a powerful military force that acts as a deterrent to expatriated American capital anywhere in the world. But this outsourcing means not only exporting money and setting up factories abroad, but also gaining control over the resources of societies there by privatizing them and exploiting them in chaotic conditions to get them for pennies. In addition, intense influence on local judicial administration and public policy is necessary to achieve this. Thus, in this model, U.S. embassies are not just diplomatic outposts, but also become centers of power in local society by building close socio-political relationships. U.S. embassies are not mere embassies, but American placeholders abroad.

This is complemented by the outsourcing of U.S. NGO networks abroad, and U.S. global foundations are building parallel states both in individual countries and in their regional associations. It is in Europe that the Soros network has become best known in recent decades, but in addition there are several smaller networks, both in Europe and on other continents of the world, such as the MacArthur Foundation, which goes hand in hand with Soros, or the Ford Foundation in the past, and now the Norwegian Foundation, which also helps. As we can see from the example of the Soros network, they have worked hard over many years to build up their press corps with media power throughout Europe - but with an emphasis on Eastern

European countries - their fighting corps of "right-wing" activists, supported by select groups of academics and lawyers, and their supporters in the courts - judges and court personnel - to determine strategic public policy. Through the system of university grants and fellowships, they have managed over the years to influence virtually all social science faculties and research centers in Hungary, and to use the media - and more recently Internet portals - to sway public opinion in their favor.

And in societies in deep crisis, largely fueled by U.S. globalist NGO and media forces, local embassies have become almost operational centers of power, and the decision on who will run in the next elections as presidential candidate, prime minister, finance minister, attorney general, etc., is also made here. This has been extensively documented in Kees van der Pijl's book analyzing the Ukrainian-Russian war, with access to U.S. intelligence wiretap transcripts and foreign policy documents, including via WikiLeaks (Pijl 2018). For example, the fact that the famous boxer Kličko did not run and become president in the 2014 Ukrainian presidential election after the "Maidan coup," also organized by the U.S. Embassy, was due to the veto of the U.S. State Department and its ambassador on the ground, who decided that Kličko and his party were supported by the country of his former boxing career, Germany, through the Konrad Adenauer Foundation of the German CDU, making them persona non grata for the United States. (Klichko eventually received the mayoralty of Kiev as a consolation prize for not jeopardizing the victory of the elected Poroshenko by not running for election).

This was a departure from Trump's brief four-year presidency and the money-dominated mainstream media and intellectual-institutional power, he has announced an isolationist turn. As the toughest opponent of the Soros network that spreads globalist domination around the world, he has allied himself with the most determined opponents of foreign governments. Thus the Hungarian, Polish, Czech and Slovenian sovereignist governments and the mainstay of national Jewry in Israel, Netanyahu, who has dominated for years, etc. And since Trump's only concern was to maintain the world power reduced to the U.S. state and to push aside the private power expansion of NGOs in the world, he could clearly see that the biggest challenge to the U.S. world power in the future is the rising world power of China. To achieve this goal, one of his main objectives was to win over economically weak Russia, which has the second largest military potential in the world after the U.S., to prevent Russia from moving closer to China. "He was in love with Putin," sneered the globalist mainstream media. But he was not, he was just a man of realpolitik, and he was not moved by private interests against the former U.S. globalists who had infiltrated the Ukrainians and acquired much of their resources.

To sum up, unlike the US globalist organization, an isolationist US organization would not give up its world power and influence, but it would reduce it to the military power of the US state and its external state - diplomatic - departments, and let the power of the US take a back seat to the private power NGO networks and their particular goals. Thus, rather than having to protect the private Ukrainian resources of the U.S. globalists - which would push the Russians into a tight Chinese alliance and immediately turn China's current world economic leadership into military supremacy - it would make the Russian goal of a neutral Ukraine, which supports the Russian goal of Russia-U.S. rapprochement, its primary objective, with an eye toward containing China in the future.

It follows that NATO, once established to counter the Soviet empire, is no longer needed to defend U.S. world power in the age of China's emerging challenge to it - indeed, it will only hinder the normalization of Russia-U.S. relations and Russia's distancing from China. Rather, a strong Asian military alliance is in the U.S. interest with Japan, South Korea, Australia, India, and even Vietnam, militarily much stronger than today and also fearful of the superpower of neighboring China.

Today, with Russia permanently stoked by the U.S. through the Ukrainians in the background and seemingly engaged in a permanent war with the U.S. in the Ukrainian proxy war, this change in military policy seems unlikely. However, should Trump succeed in running again in 2024, much could change, making it worthwhile to think through the fronts, at least in theory.

4) Europe's chances of breaking away from the American Empire.

Hungarian economist György Matolcsy called the annexation of Europe by the U.S. the American Empire in an earlier book; I called it the "global ruling order" in the years after the turn of the millennium, but the former captures the imagination better, so we should use it.

That Empire has been shaken by the Trump administration's tenure, which began in 2016, but it is the accelerated rise of China's global dominance in the wake of the pandemic in particular that calls for a rethink. Trump's election victory was brought about by the exodus of U.S. banking capital circles, briefly the sole world power after the collapse of the Soviet empire in 1990, to the world by mass outrage at the social degradation created at home. To remedy this, the new presidential administration has set the tone for bringing home capital and production brought abroad, breaking with the global private power of the leading circles of U.S. investment funds and the global foundations they support. Although they can be found all over the world, the cultural and political order has prevailed mainly in the European countries, with the formation of deep states (Deep states) in the states of the Eastern European region almost in parallel. They have been able to do so partly because the U.S.-led NATO, originally established as a counterweight to the Soviet empire, changed its profile with its disappearance and, as the millennium approached, began to operate more and more in line with the goals of the U.S. imperial private world powers. Although the French and the Germans, as major European powers, sometimes protested against it, the small Central and Eastern European states in particular, unaware of what they were doing in their great effort to join the West, stood like a solid phalanx behind the imperial United States.

In the meantime, however, not only were the problems of imperial America, which had become Rust America, emerging, but also the ambitions of the West as a whole, and China in particular, which had become enriched in exported capital and technology and had become a short-sighted power, With a population of a millennium and a half and a high level of intelligence surpassing that of the West, it has mastered Western technology and caught up with U.S. economic development in less than 30 years, and is predicted to surpass it in the next decade. In recent years, it has begun to catch up with the U.S. militarily and has built a parallel global power structure in Asia, Latin America and Africa through its alliances. As a result, the U.S. is now forced to move away from its private power expansion focused on Europe and shift its global focus to Asia, where it is beginning to build a strong military alliance to contain China.

NATO and its private power expansions in Europe have so far only hindered this, as evidenced by the current U.S. involvement in a war with Russia over Ukraine. As former President Trump's policies - but also political scientist John Mearsheimer's international power analyses - show, it will be in the U.S. interest to forge as close an alliance with Russia as possible, given the near hopelessness of resisting China, a rising military power in a few years (Mearsheimer 2014, 2014b). But the private imperial forces, mainly associated with the Democratic Party leadership, that have shifted to Europe - e.g., the Soros network is one of their main representatives - are embedded in the current Biden administration and make

militant action against Russia their main goal to protect their resources, mainly in Eastern Europe.

While the military action of the now extremely weakened Russian leadership against Ukraine's NATO accession makes U.S.-Russia rapprochement unlikely in the near future, it does not remove the main threat of China as a world power. Thus, with the likely new Trump presidency starting in 2024, much could change, and NATO could become irrelevant and even confusing to the U.S. in the institutional order of Asian-American-driven global military power competition. An isolationist U.S. will thus mean a break with imperial America when it is restored from 2024, and a move away from subordinating Europe, especially Eastern Europe, to the Asian military center of gravity. Thus, the small Central and Eastern European states could have the opportunity to assume the status of a neutral state by moving into the backyard of the world military power struggle.

Given the current Ukrainian/U.S.-Russian disputes, this may seem like a dream today, but given the implied and difficult-to-avoid change in world power relations, the dissolution of NATO and the status of liberated Hungary as a neutral state with the victory of U.S. isolationism in 2024 is very likely. Since policy must respond not only to today's realities - at least to the intellectual backgrounds of the political camps - but also to foreseeable trends of change, thinking about state neutrality in the post-NATO era is probably most topical for Hungary.

References

- Mearsheimer John (2014): Why the Ukraine Crisis Is the West's Fault. The Liberal Delusions that Provoked Putin. *Foreign Affairs* September/October 2014.
- Mearsheimer John (2014b): Can China Rise Peacefully? *The National Interest*, 2014. 56p.
- Pijl, Kees van der (2018): *Flight MH17, Ukraine and the new Cold War: Prism of Disaster*. Manchester University Press 21018.
- Shake, Kori (2008): *NATO after the Cold War, 1991-1995: Institutional Competition and the Collapse of the French Alternative*. Online by Cambridge Univ. Press