

A Manufactured World Crisis

Commentary

Few people today ask the most important question about the conflict between Russia and Ukraine. Many people want America to stay out of the fight, but even they don't ask the vital question. Why does the world face a [crisis](#) today? Why has a border dispute between Russia and Ukraine escalated to the point where people fear nuclear war?

The answer is simple. America, under the leadership of President Joe Biden and the forces controlling him, has done this and, by doing so, brought the world to the brink of disaster. As always, the great Dr. Ron Paul gets it right: "Three weeks into this terrible war, the U.S. is not pursuing talks with Russia. As [Antiwar.com](#) recently reported, instead of supporting negotiations between Ukraine and Russia that could lead to a ceasefire and an end to the bloodshed, the U.S. government is actually escalating the situation which can only increase the bloodshed.

"The constant flow of U.S. and allied weapons into Ukraine and talk of supporting an extended insurgency does not seem designed to give Ukraine a victory on the battlefield but rather to hand Russia what Secretary of State Blinken called 'a strategic defeat.'

"It sounds an awful lot like the Biden Administration intends to fight Russia down to the last Ukrainian," [wrote](#) Paul. "The only solution for the United States is to get out. Let the Russians and Ukrainians reach an agreement. That means no NATO for Ukraine and no U.S. missiles on Russia's borders? So what! End the war then end NATO."

Let's look at an analogy that will help us understand Paul's point. For

years, the Ukrainian government has attacked an area in the Donbass region that has seceded from Ukraine and formed an independent, pro-Russian, republic. Just before Putin moved against Ukraine, Ukrainians increased the scale and scope of their attack. Rick Rozoff describes what they did: "Two-thirds of Ukrainian army servicemen have been amassed along the Donbass contact line, Eduard Basurin, spokesman for the self-proclaimed Donetsk People's Republic (DPR) militia, said on Thursday.

"Another three brigades are on their way [to Donbass], which is 20,000 to 25,000 troops more. The total number will reach 150,000, not to mention the nationalists. This is about two-thirds of Ukrainian Armed Forces' personnel," Basurin said on the Rossiya 1 television channel (VGTRK) on Thursday.

[Ukrainian troops are stationed along the 320-kilometer front line](#), he said."

Unlike what has just happened, the Ukrainian attack did not result in U.S. sanctions on Ukraine. There were no meetings of the U.N. to condemn Ukrainian aggression. There was no talk of world war. On the contrary, the Ukraine government used American weapons in its attack and asked America for more weapons to continue their attack. Let's listen to [Rozoff again](#): "The Armed Forces of Ukraine used the American anti-tank missile system Javelin in the hostilities in Donbass. This was announced by the head of the Main Intelligence Directorate of the Ministry of Defense of Ukraine Kirill Budanov in an interview.

"Budanov said that ideally, the U.S. would help deter any Russian

incursion, through additional military aid and increased diplomatic and economic pressure, including more sanctions against Russia and the seizure and blocking of Russian banking accounts.

"Also, in addition to U.S. aid already promised and delivered, including Mark VI patrol boats, Javelin anti-armor systems and AN/TPQ-53 light counter-fire radar systems, Ukraine seeks additional air, missile and drone defense systems and electronic jamming devices, Budonov said. Patriot missile batteries and counter rocket, artillery and mortar systems are on Ukraine's wish list.

"The AN/TPQ-53 systems were used to great effect, Ukraine military officials have previously reported. Budanov said the Javelin systems have also been used against Russian forces. Those, along with Turkish-manufactured drones, used against Russian-aligned separatist artillery troops, have a significant psychological deterrent value, said Budanov."

Why the difference? We think that the U.S. should not have shipped arms to Ukraine. Doing this made the situation worse. But for what we're saying now, it doesn't matter what you think of the policy. The key point is that because there was no international outcry and no sanctions, the matter remained a local fight. If Biden and his team had reacted to the so-called Russian invasion in the same way, the matter would have remained a local quarrel. Russia and Ukraine would have made a deal and that would be that.

The neocon warmongers and other defenders of democracy, who unfortunately include some deluded libertarians object. Don't we have a duty to resist aggression? The answer is clear: No, we don't. We do not have a duty to evaluate every foreign quarrel and assess who is at fault. We do not have a duty to require leaders of regimes we, or rather

our masters in Washington, don't like to accept existing boundaries of countries as unchangeable. We should reject the false doctrine of "collective security," which makes every border dispute a world war.

The great American historian Charles Beard recognized what was wrong with "collective security" in the 1930s. In his article, "Giddy Minds and Foreign Quarrels," he asked: "On what ... should the foreign policy of the United States be based? Here is one answer and it is not excogitated in any professor's study or supplied by political agitators. It is the doctrine formulated by George Washington, supplemented by James Monroe, and followed by the Government of the United States until near the end of the nineteenth century, when the frenzy for foreign adventurism burst upon the country. This doctrine is simple. Europe has a set of 'primary interests' which have little or no relation to us, and is constantly vexed by 'ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice.' The United States is a continental power separated from Europe by a wide ocean which, despite all changes in warfare, is still a powerful asset of defense. In the ordinary or regular vicissitudes of European politics the United States should not become implicated by any permanent ties. We should promote commerce, but force 'nothing.' We should steer clear of hates and loves. We should maintain correct and formal relations with all established governments without respect to their forms or their religions, whether Christian, Mohammedan, Shinto, or what have you."

[Beard then responded](#) to those who wanted to scrap our traditional policy of non-intervention with "collective security": "In the rest of the world, outside this hemisphere, our interests are remote and our power to enforce our will is relatively slight. Nothing we can do for Europeans will substantially increase our trade or add to our, or their, well-being.

Nothing we can do for Asiatics will materially increase our trade or add to our, or their, well-being. With all countries in Europe and Asia, our relations should be formal and correct. As individuals we may indulge in hate and love, but the Government of the United States embarks on stormy seas when it begins to love one power and hate another officially."

We should heed Beard's wisdom today. Otherwise, the world may go up in flames.

From [Mises.org](https://mises.org).

Views expressed in this article are the opinions of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of The Epoch Times.



Follow

Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr., is founder and chairman of the Mises Institute in Auburn, Alabama, editor of LewRockwell.com, and author of "Fascism versus Capitalism."



Follow

The Mises Institute, founded in 1982, promotes teaching and research in the Austrian school of economics, individual freedom, honest history, and international peace, in the tradition of Ludwig von Mises and Murray N. Rothbard. We seek a radical shift in the intellectual climate, away from statism and toward a private property order.