

Why Russia won't invade the Ukraine, the Baltic statelets or anybody else

by

The Saker

on

[The Saker](#)



The AngloZionist propaganda machine is constantly warning us that Russia is about to invade some country. The list of candidates for invasion is long and ranges from Norway to the Ukraine and includes the Baltic statelets, Poland and even countries further West. Of course, we are also told that NATO and the US are here to prevent that. Well, thank God for them, right?

But what is conspicuously missing from this narrative is a discussion of the possible Russian motives for such a military move. Typically, we are merely told that Russia has broken the European post-Cold War order and borders by "annexing" Crimea and by sending military forces into the Donbass. Anybody with an IQ at room temperature or above by now realizes that both of these claims are total bunk. The ones who indeed broke the post-Cold War international order and borders were the NATO member states when they used military force, in complete illegality, to break-up Yugoslavia. As for the people of Crimea, they had the opportunity to vote about their future in a referendum, very much unlike the inhabitants of Kosovo which had no such opportunity. As for the 08.08.08 war, even the Europeans who eventually, and very reluctantly, agreed that it was, in fact, Saakashvili who started this conflict, not Russia.

But let's set all this aside and assume that the Russian leaders would not hesitate to use military force again if it was to their advantage. Let's assume that, yes, the Russians are up to no good and that they might well try to bite-off some other piece of land somewhere in Europe.

Such an assumption would immediately raise a crucial question: **why** would the Russians want to do that?

For some reason, this question is rarely, if ever, asked.

Oh sure, we are told that "Putin wants to rebuild the Soviet Union" or some other type of empire but, again, nobody seems to wonder **why** he would want that!

So let's look at possible rationales for such an attack:

Reason number one: to gain more land

That is probably the least credible reason of all. [Russia](#) is a vast country (17,098,246 km²) with a relatively small population (144,526,636) resulting in a very low population density. Not only is Russia huge, but her territory has immense natural resources. The very last thing Russia needs is more land.

Reason number two: to increase the Russian population

Well, yes, Russia has a population deficit for sure. But that does not mean that just any population increase would be a bonanza for Russia. For example, Russia will only be in a worse shape if the number of people depending on unemployment, social services or pensions increases. Likewise, Russia would not benefit from a politically hostile population. So while Russia could benefit from having a larger population, what she needs is more young and well-educated ***Russians***, not unemployed and destitute Ukrainians or Lithuanians! The massive influx of Ukrainian refugees, by the way, has already contributed to an increase in qualified specialists, including medical doctors and highly qualified engineers from the Ukrainian military-industrial specialists who, when they saw their bureaus and industries collapse in the Ukraine, moved to Russia to continue to work. There is no need for the Russia to invade anybody to get those highly qualified specialists. As for Ukrainians without special qualifications, they have already shown up in Russia, and the last thing Russia needs is more of them (they can go scrub toilets in Poland or the UK). Furthermore, there are already a lot of immigrants from other parts of the world in Russia and getting more of them is hardly a good idea. So while Russia would benefit from more qualified young Russians, invading other countries is not the way to get them.

Reason number three: geostrategic reasons

What about the Baltic ports? What about the Ukrainian gas pipelines? The truth is that in the Soviet times the Baltic ports or the Ukrainian pipelines were crucial strategic assets. But since their independence, these countries have not only ruined themselves and destroyed the infrastructure they inherited from the "Soviet occupiers," but Russia has also successfully replaced the infrastructure and industries she lost after 1991. Thus, for example, Russia has actively developed her own commercial ports on the Baltic Sea, and they have now outgrown the ones found in the Baltic states (see [here](#) for a good comparative chart). As for the Ukrainian pipelines, not only are they in terrible shape, Russia has successfully built "North" and "South" streams which allow her to completely bypass the Ukraine and the need to deal with the crazy Banderite junta in Kiev. The simple truth is that while the Baltic statelets or the Ukronazis can fancy themselves as a very precious prize, Russia has absolutely no need for them whatsoever.

In fact, the opposite is true: right now, Russia can barely finance all the reconstruction programs which are so urgently needed after decades of nationalist rule in Crimea. In the future, Russia will also have to help the Donbass rebuild. Does anybody seriously believe that the Russians can afford to rescue even more countries or territories?!

Reason number four: revanchist motives

That is the Hillary Clinton/Zbigniew Brzezinski argument: the Russians are inherently expansionists, imperialists, militarists, and revanchists and they don't need a motive to invade somebody: that's



simply what they do – invade, terrorize, oppress. Well, a quick objective look at history would prove that it is the West which has always displayed such behavior, not Russia, but we can even ignore that fact. The truth is that while there are a lot of people in Russia who have good memories of their lives in the Soviet Union, there is just no constituency pushing for the re-birth of the Soviet Union or for any kind of imperialism. If anything, most Russians are much more isolationist, and they don't want to get involved in wars or the invasion of foreign countries. This is not only a result of memories of wars in Afghanistan or interventions in Germany, Hungary or Czechoslovakia, but also the bitter realization that even the so-called "Orthodox brothers" (some of whom even owe the existence of their country on a world map to Russia!) have now fully turned against Russia and have become willing NATO-colonies (think Bulgaria or Romania here). Yes, Putin did say that the collapse of the Soviet Union was a tragedy (objectively, it was, and it brought immense suffering to millions of people), but that does not at all mean that Putin, or anybody else, actually wants to "resurrect" the Soviet Union, even if it was feasible (which it is not). If anything, it was the US, NATO, and the EU which, for purely ideological reasons chose to expand their influence to the East and which are now constantly engaged in a nonstop campaign of russophobia (phobia in both meanings of "fear" and "hatred"). Yes, Russians are disgusted with the West, but that hardly means that they want to invade it.

Reason number five: megalomania

Well, maybe the Russians are mad that they lost the Cold War and now want to become a superpower again? In fact, no. Not at all. Not only do Russians not feel that they "lost" the Cold War, they even feel that they are already a superpower: one which successfully defies the Empire and which continues to struggle for full sovereignization at a time when all European countries are competing with each other for the title of most subservient lackey of the Empire. Just like the USSR after WWII, Russia, after the nightmare of the 1990s, has very successfully rebuilt, in spite of the constant subversion and sabotage of the "united West" which tried every dirty trick in the book to prevent Russia from recovering from the horrors which the western-backed (and, really, run) "liberal democracy" imposed upon her during the Eltsin years. Sure, Russians want their country to be prosperous and powerful, but that does not mean that they want to become a USA-like world hegemon which gets involved in every conflict on the planet. Truth be told, even the bad old USSR was not anti-USA and never had the kind of global ambition the USA has (well, except for Trotsky, but Stalin gave the boot to those crazies, many of whom later emigrated to the USA and re-branded themselves as Neocons). Of course, there is the eternal Russian "court jester," aka "Zhirik" aka Vladimir Zhironovskii. He has made all sorts of threats (including nuclear ones) against various countries neighboring Russia, but everybody knows that he is just that, a court jester and that what he says is basically utter nonsense.

Reason number six: to save Putin's "regime."

It is true that unpopular regimes use war to distract from their failures and to make the population switch off their brains for the sake of "circling the wagons" and being "patriotic." That is most definitely what Poroshenko is doing right now. But Putin has no such need! Even if the pension reform did cost him quite a bit in terms of popularity, he is still far more popular at home (and even internationally!) than any political leader in the West and [the Russian economy is doing just fine](#), in spite of the famous sanctions. True, the mostly Atlantic Integrationist Medvedev government is not very popular, but those officials (like Shoigu or Lavrov) who are typically associated with Putin and his Eurasian Sovereignists remain very popular. The simple truth is that Putin has no need for any "distracting crises" because he remains remarkably popular in spite of all the difficulties Russia is currently facing. If anything, it is the Trumps, Macrons, Mays, and Co. who need a distracting war, not Putin!

I could go on listing more nonsensical pseudo-reasons for why Russia would want to occupy some piece of land somewhere, each more far-fetched and baseless than the previous one, but you get the point: Russia has no interest whatsoever in military interventions. In fact, what Russia needs more than anything else is peace for as long as possible.

Now, let's come back to reality,



Putin is a continuator of another great Russian reformer: Petr Arkadievich Stolypin

The Chairman of the Council of Ministers and Prime Minister of Russia from 1906 to 1911, Petr Arkadievich Stolypin, once famously said *"Next comes our main task: to strengthen our lower classes. In them lies the strength of our country. There are more than 100 millions of them and the roots of our state will be healthy and strong and, believe me, the voice of the Russian government before Europe and the rest of the world will sound very differently. Our motto, of all of us Russians, should be a united, common labor based on mutual trust. Give Russia 20 years of peace, internal and external, and you will not recognize today's Russia"* (this is my own, free, translation. This is the original text: *На очереди главная наша задача — укрепить низы. В них вся сила страны. Их более 100 миллионов и будут здоровы и крепки корни у государства, поверьте — и слова Русского Правительства совсем иначе зазвучат перед Европой и перед целым миром... Дружная, общая, основанная на взаимном доверии работа — вот девиз для нас всех, Русских. Дайте Государству 20 лет покоя, внутреннего и внешнего, и вы не узнаете нынешней России).*

Of course, Stolypin was eventually murdered by a Jewish revolutionary, [Mordechai Gershtovich Bogrov](#), and Russia was forced to enter WWI. Eventually, the Russian monarchy was overthrown by a Masonic conspiracy lead by Alexander Kerensky. These "liberals" (i.e., plutocrats) did exactly what their successors did under Eltsin and plunged Russia into utter chaos. Eight months later, the Bolsheviks seized power, and the civil war began. Instead of 20 years of peace, Russia got 30 years of wars. After immense sacrifices and many horrors, Russia only succeeded in recovering after the end of WWII.

Nobody in Russia wants to repeat this terrible experience even if, in the end, Russia would prevail. The costs are just too high.

Today, just like in 1911, Russia needs internal and external peace more than anything else, and that is not what she would get if she got involved in some foreign military adventure! In fact, attacking an alliance which includes three nuclear power would be suicidal, and the Russians are anything but suicidal.

If Russia needs peace so badly, why the constant rumors of war?

That is really simple! First, Poroshenko is in deep trouble and short of a major crisis his only option is to completely steal the election. That latter option might be tricky, because if the "collective West" as always, turns a blind eye to the actions of the Ukronazi regime, the internal opposition to Poroshenko might not. Then some serious civil unrest, or even a counter-coup, are real possibilities. Hence Poroshenko's desperate need for a crisis.

They say that an image is worth a thousand words. Well, in that spirit, check this one:



Left: martial law regions Right: regions which voted against Poroshenko in 2014 (by the way, this does suggest some kind of future border, don't it? :-)

QED, right?

There is also another reason, a particularly shameful one: while it is true that Hitler and the AngloZionists did, eventually, fight each other, it is also true that in many ways Hitler truly embodied the dream of a "united Europe" and a "reborn western civilization" (albeit a pagan one!). In the history of European imperialism, Hitler represents something of an apogee, at least until the USA superseded the Nazis as a global hegemon after WWII. There is not much difference between Hitler's (oh so modestly promised) "thousand year Reich" and Fukuyama's "end of history" (or, for that matter, the Marxist idea of realized Communism which also would end history by solving the dialectical contradictions which are the engine of history). On a psychological level, Hitler was the continuator of the Popes and Napoleon - a self-described "*Kulturträger*" bringing "western civilization" to the barbaric subhuman "*Untermensch*" mongoloid hordes of the East. So while Hitler was most definitely an "SOB," he sure was "our SOB" (hence the impotent rage my use of the term "Ukronazi" elicits in various type of defenders of "Western civilization" or, even better, a supposed "White civilization"!)). Well, we all know how these Nazi "culture-carrying" White supremacists ended, don't we:



sic transit gloria mundi indeed...

[Парад Победы 1945. Флаги нацистской Германии повержены](#)

[Проконвоирование немцев через Москву 17 июля 1944](#)

These carriers of the values of a "united Europe" and "western civilization" were totally defeated by these men:



These are the men who destroyed 80% of the Nazi military and who **really** won WWII (not Patton or MacArthur!)

These memories are what truly terrifies the western elites: the existence of a ***different civilizational realm*** which not only dares to defy the AngloZionist Empire openly, but which has already defeated every western hegemonic power which dared to attacked it in the past.

The Russian people, by the way, see the current confrontation in the very similar "mental coordinates" as the western Russophobes, just with an inverted value sign meaning that they perfectly understand that the kind of war the Empire is waging against Russia right now has its roots in the outcome of WWII. This is one of the reasons they all cherish the memories of the millions who died fighting "western civilization" and a "united Europe." This is best shown by the "Immortal Regiments" in all the Russian cities:



The "Immortal Regiment" as an expression of the acute historical awareness of the Russian people

This historical awareness is also shown in the parade of Ukronazi POW in Donetsk:

[Пленные Украинские солдаты на параде в Донецке.](#)

Again, the reference to WWII is unmistakable.

As I have said many times in the past, one of the most significant differences between Russia and the "collective West" is that Russians fear war but are nevertheless prepared to fight it, whereas the westerners do not fear war, even though they are not prepared for it at all. Truly, "fools rush in where angels fear to tread" (think Pompeo, Mattis and the rest of them here). And yet, despite this apparent *insouciance*, the leaders of the AngloZionists have an almost genetic fear and hatred of Russia, because they remember how all their predecessors were eventually defeated by the Russian nation.

And, finally, let's remember the crucial question which Bertolt Brecht asked: "*How can anyone tell the truth about Fascism unless he is willing to speak out against capitalism, which brings it forth?*". Yes, in words, and in words only, the collective West has condemned Fascism and National-Socialism. But in deeds? No, not at all. This is why Fascist scum à la Poroshenko **always** get the support of the western elites under the pious heading of "*he is an SOB, but he is our SOB*"?

*Sidebar: think of it, during the Crimean War the putatively "Christian West" united with the (**Muslim**) Ottoman Empire Against Russia. During the revolutionary years, US Jewish bankers fully financed the **Bolsheviks**. Just before WWII, the Brits likewise financed **Hitler**. During WWI and WWII the West backed **Ukie separatists**, including bona fide **Nazis**. During the Cold War, the West fully backed the **Wahabi** nutcases in Saudi Arabia (no, MBS is not the first bloodthirsty Saudi maniac!) and in Afghanistan. The West also supported **Apartheid South Africa** for as long as politically possible. In Latin America the USA gladly supported what Roger Waters called Latin American "meatpacking glitterati", that is the **many military regimes** who all were garden variety **Fascists**. In Kosovo the USAF became the **KLA's** Air Force even though the USA had previously considered the KLA as a dangerous terrorist organization (that was against the Serbs but, according to Strobe Talbott, the main goal here was to show Russia what could happen to her if she resisted). During the Chechen wars,*



*the West fully backed the **Takfiri** crazies. Then, after 9/11, the USA finally got fully in bed with **al-Qaeda** (especially in Syria) even though the official fairy tale wants us to believe that al-Qaeda and Bin Laden were responsible for the death of 3000 people (nevermind that NIST admitted by direct implication the destruction of WTC7 with explosives (**1**)). Does anybody doubt that if **Satan himself** took on a body and appeared before us the USA would fully and totally back him as long as he promised to be anti-Russian or, even better, anti-Orthodox? By allying itself for decades with what can fairly be described as the worst evil scum of mankind, as the not already been allied with Satan for many, many, year?*

Honestly, we should have no illusions about the nature of the western plutocracy, and we should always heed the Marxist truism which states that "*the state is an apparatus of violence which fulfills the will of the ruling class.*" We all know who the ruling class of the AngloZionist Empire is composed of, don't we?

Western liberal democracies are, in reality, plutocracies which were created by a class of capitalist thugs with the purpose of controlling our entire planet. This was true before WWII. This was also true during and after WWII and this has not changed, notwithstanding all the sanguine denunciations of Fascism and Nazism.

What this means is that it is the western ruling elites which need war to survive and preserve the New World Order they have attempted to impose on all of us. Russia does not need war – she only needs peace.

Conclusion: relax, folks, the Russians ain't coming, I promise!

AngloZionist paranoid collective hallucinations notwithstanding, the Russians are **not** coming. Yes, they will annihilate you if you are crazy enough to attack them but, no, they are not coming, at least not of their own volition. Not even to liberate the Russian minorities in Apartheid Latvia or the Nazi-occupied Ukrainian Banderastan. The Russian policy towards these regimes is very simple: let them collapse on their own. After all, they will all eventually come knocking sooner or later, as ideological delusions are powerless against geographical realities.

I will let a much better person than myself conclude this article.

This is what Professor Stephen Cohen recently had to say about the risks of war:

[Stephen Cohen on Cancelled Trump-Putin Meeting at G20 Summit](#)

He indeed is the "voice of one crying in the wilderness."

Will enough people listen to him to avoid an apocalypse?

I don't know.

The Saker

Footnote 1: the [US government – through NIST – officially recognized the fact that the WTC7 building fell at a free-fall speed for 2.25 seconds](#) (for a detailed discussion of this please check out the video which I posted [here](#)). Do those 2,25 seconds really matter? Hell yes!! What this means is that the US government admits that for 2,25 seconds WTC7 fell without any kind of resistance to slow it down and this, therefore, means that there was nothing under the collapsing section. So this begs an obvious question: since we now know that there was nothing under the collapsing section and since we also know that there was a steel frame building there seconds before the collapse – what happened in between those two events? There is only one possible answer to this question: the steel-framed section of the building which would have normally slowed down the collapsing section of the building was removed a) extremely rapidly b) symmetrically. There is only one technology which can do that: explosives. The above is simply not a matter of opinion. This is a fact. Likewise, it is a fact that fires could not have removed a section of WTC7 the way



it was observed. Amazing but true: NIST itself admitted that explosives were used.