

# افغانستان آزاد – آزاد افغانستان

AA-AA

چو کشور نیاشد تن من مباد      بدین بوم ویر زنده یک تن مباد  
همه سر به سر تن به کشتن دهیم      از آن به که کشور به دشمن دهیم

[www.afgazad.com](http://www.afgazad.com)

[afgazad@gmail.com](mailto:afgazad@gmail.com)

European Languages

زبان های اروپایی

[http://english.pravda.ru/world/americas/08-09-2014/128476-usa\\_aggressor-0/?mode=print](http://english.pravda.ru/world/americas/08-09-2014/128476-usa_aggressor-0/?mode=print)

## USA is the major aggressor in the world

9/8/2014



Vladimir Putin said that Russia was not going to wave its army like a razor. Barack Obama said that the United States was not going to use the army as a hammer. Rare peaceful unanimity of the leaders of the two largest nuclear powers can not but make one feel uplifted. What is the difference between these two statements? Pravda.Ru asked expert opinion from the Director of the Center for Public Policy Research, Vladimir Evseyev.

*"Obviously, it is mutually dangerous to wave a nuclear potential left and right. Still, after many threats and growing confrontation such synchronous statements came rather unexpectedly. Do they mean that the world is now safe?"*

"The fact that words coincide does not mean that actions will coincide too. It would be completely incorrect to believe that Russia and the United States share a common vision for the use of armed forces in the world. The United States is now the dominant military power. The principal objective of the USA is to ensure military leadership in the world in the first place. To achieve that, the USA needs to maintain a large number of military bases globally. I think that reduction in the number of military bases will be minimal. One can only talk about the reduction of military personnel on the bases. The Americans, announcing their departure from Afghanistan, do everything to stay in the west of Afghanistan. They chose a place, where the production of drugs is concentrated, in the vicinity of Iran, not missing an opportunity to show influence on neighboring states.

Therefore, the United States, declaring its love for peace, is, in fact, regrouping forces. It just so happens that the United States is forced to cut its presence in some places, although it does not mean that the United States is going to weaken its military pressure on a global scale.

Russia is not a state, which holds global military superiority. It is only the USA that possesses the quality, save for the nuclear sphere. Therefore, Russia has completely different objectives. In the first place, they relate to regional issues, the post-Soviet space. On these territories, Russia is ready to firmly defend its positions, and armed forces are required for this. But Russia does not say that she intends to seize the Baltic and Ukraine. At the same time, Russia has been strengthening military and technical cooperation with several countries.

"That is, Russia and the United States have fundamentally different approaches to the use of force. The United States is using armed forces to impose its policies on others. For Russia, armed forces make a part of foreign policy, rather than the basis of foreign policy - this is what underpins our foreign policy initiatives.

"The United States, in September last year, was planning to overthrow Bashar al-Assad. The Americans were ready to strike multiple air strikes on Syria. Russia deployed a group of warships near the Syrian coast. That is, Russia, in fact, acted as the force to suppress USA's aggression.

"The aggressor in the world is mostly the United States. What Obama says is not true to fact. Suffice it to recall elements of their strategy. Obama said earlier that he was going to shift the center of gravity to the Pacific. One can not do it, if one wants to be a peacemaker. The whole matter is not about peacekeeping operations - this is about containing China.

"Therefore, the positions of Russia and the United States are different, the sphere of activity and armed forces of Russia and the United States are also fundamentally different, and their goals are

different too. For Russia, it is of paramount importance to ensure stability near the Russian border. For the United States, it is vitally important to impose its foreign policy around the world. At the same time, the United States lacks resources, including military ones. The Americans will never unveil the actions that they are hiding behind their words."

*"Do you agree that the tactics of the war has changed? Do you think that this is USA vs. Russia in Ukraine and Russia against the West in Syria? Do you think that modern wars now involve third parties?"*

"This is typical for the United States. Not only in Ukraine, but everywhere. In Syria, it's the same. The USA has been using others for long already, and this tradition is being manifested more clearly. They unleash wars directly in Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya and then switch to the tactics of the war by proxy. It was observed earlier, it is now particularly characteristic. The United States does not want to get involved in wars to save resources.

"What is now happening in Ukraine is typical for the United States, not only for the current US administration, but for the United States in general. When Soviet troops entered Afghanistan, the United States did not send its troops to Afghanistan. The Americans were fighting in Afghanistan through other people's hands, the hands of radicals. On the one hand, the United States declares its determination to the struggle against terrorism, but on the other hand, the Americans condone and support terrorism.

"The Americans constantly contradict to themselves. They try to hide behind the shield of democracy, the fight against terrorism. In fact, they always think only about the implementation of American national interests, without any consideration of the needs of the people, who live in conflict zones. They just use them. The use the Kiev junta in Ukraine, they use the Iraqi authorities, they use Turkey to put pressure on Assad. This is typical American politics.

"All the talking about democracy, stability the fight against terrorism is just a cover. In reality, there is only rough, arrogant American foreign policy. Of course, one can always declare love for peace, receive the Nobel Peace Prize, etc., but it's outer shell. In fact, foreign policy of the United States is extremely aggressive. This aggression is not diminishing, but now they have to take into account limited resources. They started to use in other countries as their vassals. This practice has become more common, because the Americans simply do not have enough resources."

*"Does it mean that there will be no direct war in Ukraine between Russia and the United States?"*

"No, there will be no direct invasion of the United States on the territory of Ukraine. Moreover, the USA's attention to Ukraine will weaken. Now the United States is very busy with many other things, and Ukraine is not their only problem. The Ukrainian junta has been discrediting the United States. Look at State Department officials dodging all the time. It looks like they are all on pins and needles when they go to a press conference. Hiding glaring facts becomes impossible. The Kiev junta constantly discredits the United States in the eyes of its European partners as well. Ukraine, in fact, becomes a burden for the United States.

"A similar story occurred to Georgia's Saakashvili. The Americans supported him as well, announced Russia's aggression in Georgia, but in the end they had to bring him down. I think the same is in store for Poroshenko, this is inevitable. It will be good for him, if the Americans simply give up on him rather than hang him in Kiev. This option is also possible. Of course, the Americans won't do it with their hands, but the radicals will.

"The United States is not going to fight on the territory of Ukraine, but it would very much like to see Russia fighting on the territory of Ukraine. This again speaks of extremely strong and blatant foreign policy of the USA."