

Lies Surrounding the Ukraine War

Analysis by Dr. Joseph Mercola



December 13, 2022

STORY AT-A-GLANCE

- > Jeffrey Sachs, a professor of economics who's been involved in diplomacy in more than 100 countries for decades, spoke to Russell Brand, an English comedian and actor, about lies surrounding the Ukraine War
- > Extreme censorship has silenced any open discussion that goes against the official narrative on the war in Ukraine
- > The mainstream media is clear in its message that the Ukraine war is the result of an unprovoked and unjustified invasion, but there's a history to it
- > Western officials and media have by and large blamed Russia for blowing up the Nord Stream pipelines, but the other side to the story suggests the U.S. did it
- > The U.S. continues to flex its imperialist muscles, this time by apparently seeking to escalate the conflict between Russia and Ukraine

As we know, "the U.S. lies for a living," says Jeffrey Sachs, the former director of The Earth Institute at Columbia. Sachs is also an adviser to the United Nations and a professor of economics who's been involved in diplomacy in more than 100 countries for decades. He made this comment to Russell Brand, an English comedian and actor, in their interview above, which covers media lies, including about the Ukraine War.

"The mainstream media do nothing about [the lies]," Sachs continued, "just amplifies them. And it's getting pretty dangerous. That's the real problem. It's a very dangerous

time right now because we seem not to be able to have an adult conversation about almost anything, in the mainstream."4

Over the past several months, the U.S. has poured billions of tax dollars into Ukraine, ostensibly to help Ukraine fight for freedom and preserve democracy. This despite the fact that Ukraine has long been deemed one of the most corrupt countries in the world, and no one knows where all this money is actually going.

America's meddling in the Ukraine conflict also reveals that it is not willing to relinquish its imperialistic tendencies. But extreme censorship has silenced any open discussion that goes against the official narrative on the war in Ukraine.

Extreme Censorship Is Shaping Reality

Sachs tells Brand that when he grew up, newspapers enjoyed dissing on political figures. But now, "these papers don't do anything but repeat the lies. And it's extremely strange to me." Due to his experience, Sachs knows a lot of reporters, and they actually tell him that they're unable to report freely:

"They tell me privately, 'Yeah, what you're saying is right, but our editor is not so interested in it' ... Corporate ownership, yes, it's definitely part of it. But the complete collapse of professionalism in journalism in these mainstream media — not everywhere, because there are some really brave people out there — but in, what we call the mainstream, it's pathetic and very dangerous."

Even as the war grows increasingly dangerous, there is no open discussion — only a one-sided dictate that's spread over the airwaves. Sachs explained:⁷

"We're deep into a war that is escalating and we can't even have a decent discussion about what the sources of this war are and how to end it. I've had the experience. I wrote for one project syndicate for 20 years. I was their most-published writer. But they wouldn't print the pieces that I wrote that were contrary to the official line about this war. It was pretty amazing to me after 20 years. I couldn't post a piece. And that's not good, in my view."

What does this level of censorship and control suggest? The clues can be found in our heavily militarized government, which is the overarching theme across party lines:8

"I've been involved with dozens of governments across the world for 40 years now. Basically, the neocons took over U.S. foreign policy 30 years ago. And it hasn't really mattered whether it's democrats or republicans ... the mainstream of our political system in both parties is militarized, and our foreign policy is largely based on secrecy. So we don't even see what our government is doing.

Nothing is explained, nothing is debated anymore, and that's been true for a long time. It's been true across the administration, so it's not a partisan thing."

Was the Ukraine War Really Unprovoked?

The mainstream media is clear in its message that the Ukraine war is the result of an unprovoked and unjustified invasion. But was it really? Further, if you're still thinking this war is only between the Ukraine and Russia, think again.

"Now we're in a war in Ukraine. And we are in it. This is absolutely a war between the United States and Russia. It's extraordinarily dangerous. We're told every day in the mainstream media — an unprovoked war that started on February 24, 2022, which is false," Sachs said. "There's a history to this. There was a way to avoid this war. Biden didn't choose it. But none of it is properly debated at all. That's really what we're facing."

Sachs, in fact, pleaded with the White House to negotiate peace and discourage Ukraine from joining NATO. They refused, saying anyone has the right to join NATO if they want to. But as astutely noted by Sachs, this isn't about the "right" of Ukraine to join NATO, it's about the threat that poses to its neighbors, Russia in particular.

Russia has long been very clear about the fact that it will not allow Ukraine to join NATO, for the simple fact that it would place a NATO military presence right on its border.

Russia wants Ukraine to remain an independent "buffer zone" between itself and NATO countries.

Would the U.S. be fine with Mexico forming a military alliance with China, installing Chinese military at our southern border? Sachs wonders. That's highly unlikely, yet that's what they're pursuing in Ukraine.

Since Russia's entry into Ukraine, the U.S. has done nothing but push for the escalation of conflict, to the point that we're now hearing predictions about nuclear war. Why would we take such risks? To take a stand for Ukraine's "right" to join NATO? It's beyond irrational, but that's where we are.

Who Blew Up the Nord Stream Pipelines?

Another piece to the puzzle lies with who blew up the Nord Stream pipelines. September 26, 2022, massive "leaks" were detected in two Russian pipelines, Nord Stream 1 and Nord Stream 2, which deliver natural gas from Russia to Europe underneath the Baltic Sea. Within a couple of days, several countries, including Russia, agreed the leaks were the result of intentional sabotage or an act of terrorism. But the question remains: Who did it?

Western officials and media have by and large blamed Russia itself. The Washington Post suggested Russian President Vladimir Putin is "fully weaponizing the Nord Stream pipelines." Bob Rae, Canada's ambassador to the United Nations, accused Russia of "using pollution as an act of war." 10

The Center for Strategic and International Studies admitted that Russia's motives for attacking its own pipelines are unclear, but that it "may be warning and signaling to Europe and the West that it is willing to target civilian infrastructure." Putin has dismissed such allegations as "stupid," and is placing the blame on the West, the U.S. in particular. Sachs weighed in with his take on who did it:13

"It's pretty interesting who blew up the Nord Stream Pipeline. One president, I know, said if Russia invades, that's the end of the pipeline. 14 And then when asked, 'Well, what do you mean Mr. President,' he said, 'Well, we have our ways.'

Then after the pipeline is blown up, the Secretary of State said this is a tremendous opportunity to wean Europe from Russia. Well, what's the narrative?

The narrative is Russia did it. And the newspapers say, 'U.S. officials say Russia did it.' Russia blew up its own pipeline. Its own billions of dollars of infrastructure. The pipeline that carries Russian energy to European markets ... whereas the other side said they were going to do it. This narrative business, it's really pretty clear."

Who stands to gain from the pipelines' demise? Russia lost a multibillion-dollar investment, long-term wealth potential and hence geopolitical power, and present-day leverage against NATO sanctions.

Aside from "sending a message" that it's willing to destroy civilian infrastructure, it gains nothing from sabotaging its own pipelines. Such a message would have been far clearer and more rational had they attacked someone else's infrastructure and not its own.

The U.S., however, certainly appears to have both motive and intention. U.S. officials have publicly stated they would "one way or another" eliminate Nord Stream 2 if Russia decided to invade Ukraine, which, of course, it did.

By sabotaging the pipelines, the U.S. stands to gain financially by increasing its own natural gas exports, and it gains by weakening Russia's income potential and leverage over Europe. The loss of the pipelines also benefits the U.S. by putting Europe in a situation where it cannot be tempted to leave America's side against Russia. As noted by The American Conservative:¹⁵

"Winter is soon arriving in Europe. If European peoples get tired of being cold, and/or paying a fortune for heating, they may take to the streets to demand that their governments push for peace negotiations between Russia and Ukraine, so that the flow of Russian gas can start again. But now, with the Nord Stream pipelines badly damaged, that possibility has been foreclosed ..."

Is War What They Want?

Ukraine has long been used as a pathway — during WWI and WWII — for Western powers as they attempted to conquer the East. But, as noted in "Ukraine on Fire," a 2016 documentary produced by Oliver Stone, "every time, Ukrainians ended up paying the highest price for these grand games of power." As a result, Ukraine, being surrounded by greater powers on all sides, had to master the art of changing sides.

The U.S., meanwhile, has long meddled in the affairs of other countries against the wishes of the very populations we claim to have "rescued." As explained in a "Democracy Now!" video titled "Overthrow: 100 Years of U.S. Meddling and Regime Change," "By one count, the United States has interfered in more than 80 foreign elections between 1946 and 2000. And that doesn't count U.S.-backed coups and invasions." 17

As Brand put it, "In case after case, we are seeing, whether it's the war, NATO expansionism, meddling in foreign democracies, a sort of psychotic, vampiric recklessness, followed by maddening lies." Indeed, even now, the U.S. is still flexing its imperialist muscles, this time by apparently seeking to escalate the conflict between Russia and Ukraine. And ultimately, imperialism, which the U.S. has perfected, is globalism.

As explained by investigative journalist Whitney Webb, the Ukraine-Russia conflict may be "the opening act for the newest iteration of the seemingly endless 'War on Terror," leading to further fear among the population. A fearful people, in turn, will willingly give emergency powers to leaders, who will use them to take your rights away "for your own safety."

Sources and References

- 1,4 YouTube, Russell Brand, This is How the US Have Lied About Ukraine War, November 6, 2022, 1:10
- ² Columbia SIPA, Jeffrey Sachs
- 3 YouTube, Russell Brand, This is How the US Have Lied About Ukraine War, November 6, 2022, 8:29
- ^{5, 6} YouTube, Russell Brand, This is How the US Have Lied About Ukraine War, November 6, 2022, 2:45
- ⁷ YouTube, Russell Brand, This is How the US Have Lied About Ukraine War, November 6, 2022, 3:23
- 8 YouTube, Russell Brand, This is How the US Have Lied About Ukraine War, November 6, 2022, 4:45
- 9 YouTube, Russell Brand, This is How the US Have Lied About Ukraine War, November 6, 2022, 6:19

- 10 YouTube Tucker Carlson September 27, 2022
- ¹¹ CSIS September 29, 2022
- ¹² Yahoo News September 30, 2022
- ¹³ YouTube, Russell Brand, This is How the US Have Lied About Ukraine War, November 6, 2022, 6:49
- ¹⁴ Reuters February 7, 2022
- 15 The American Conservative September 28, 2022
- 16 Rumble March 8, 2022
- 17 Bitchute May 2, 2022
- 18 YouTube, Russell Brand, This is How the US Have Lied About Ukraine War, November 6, 2022, 9:06
- 19 The Last American Vagabond March 2, 2022