

THE NEW WORLD ORDER AND THE WAR IN UKRAINE

1. *The struggle for Ukraine began three decades ago.*

In 1990, after the victory in the Cold War, the then American President George H. W. Bush proclaimed a New World Order: The core of this new order was that the U.S. wanted to maintain and expand the dominance it had won in the world at that time.

Charles Krauthammer, a leading commentator on international affairs, has spoken of the "unipolar moment," that is, the unique opportunity for the United States to lead the world alone. Francis Fukuyama has written of the "end of history" because American values of democracy and capitalism have fully prevailed. Hillary Clinton then confirmed this stance years later when she said, "The time for spheres of interest is over," and probably meant the rest of the world. For the USA still maintained 800 military bases worldwide.

The war in Ukraine is about asserting this American domination; or about how power will be divided in a future world order. In this sense, American President Joe Biden has stated that the goal of the United States in this war is to defeat Russia, if possible to bring about a regime change in Moscow, and Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy has joined in these demands.

To enforce these goals, the U.S. has agreed to provide \$51 billion in weapons assistance to Ukraine; deliver essential intelligence and images of Ukrainian soldiers critical to the war.

Russian President Vladimir Putin, for his part, elaborated in a lengthy speech before the invasion of Russian troops on February 24 of this year that Ukraine is an artificial state. Moreover, the massive arms buildup under the current leadership in Kiev poses a threat to his country. In addition, the Ukrainian government has broken all the agreements in the Minsk Agreement to protect the Russian-speaking population. Moreover, according to Putin, the time of sole American domination in the world is over.

In this conflict, the representatives of the European Union have totally subordinated their policy to American interests. The greatest achievements of European unification were abandoned, namely: replacing confrontation with cooperation; warfare with welfare. NATO's Article 5 "all for one" became Article F35: all must buy their weapons from one manufacturer, namely the USA.

Ray Dalio writes in his book "Why Nations Succeed and Fail": "International relations are driven by raw power dynamics. There are laws within countries, between them raw power matters"(1). In this sense, the war in Ukraine is about whether or not the country remains under total American domination.

2. *Is Ukraine about values or interests?*

In contrast to the statement that international relations are largely about power politics, we read and hear every day that the Ukraine war is about noble values; about democracy and freedom; about Ukraine's independence and its sovereignty.

Anyone dealing with English or American foreign policy must first break through the smoke screen of fine words. Officially, the English and Americans have never fought for power, interests or profits in history, but only for noble values and against evil.

Oliver Cromwell, for example, stipulated in the "Navigation Act" of 1651 that goods to England could only be transported on English ships. He condemned his opponents as an "axis of evil" and at the same time stated: "The interests of England and the will of God are congruent". After the Battle of Höchstädt, in the War of the Spanish Succession, the victorious English commander John Churchill, 1st Duke of Marlborough, declared, "We fought for the freedom of Europe." In fact, the English then obtained a monopoly over the transatlantic slave trade through the subsequent Peace of Utrecht.

In the middle of the 19th century, the opium wars against China were waged by Great Britain under the motto "open door policy". The English wanted to buy silk, porcelain and tea from China; but the Chinese did not want to deliver, and above all did not want to buy anything. So they were forced by force of arms to import opium.

President Woodrow Wilson, who led the USA into the First World War, is still considered an icon of idealism today. In fact, in 1916 he still ran his election campaign under the slogan of not entering the war. But then, when American war credits were threatened due to German victories, he changed his mind. The United States entered the First World War "to end all wars and to make the world safe for democracy," and the 2003 Iraq intervention was officially about "bringing democracy to the Middle East.

The emphasis on values is always a multiple manipulation: in fact, it is often about political and economic interests. Even these are then mostly not national interests, but those of individuals or groups.

Ukraine is about the domination of the USA. The U.S. Deputy Secretary of State, Victoria Nuland, made this clear to the U.S. ambassador in Kiev years ago and at the same time told him what kind of government Washington wants in Ukraine. The ambassador's objection that the EU might not agree with this was met with the curt reply: "We have already invested billions of dollars in Ukraine, now we will probably be able to determine the government". Not a word about what the Ukrainians actually want.

As for "Ukrainian values," before the war it was consistently reported that Ukraine was not a functioning democracy. This was primarily because the various minorities were not granted agreed-upon rights; because opposition parties were banned; and because critical television stations had simply been shut down. Moreover, Transparency International ranked the state as one of the most corrupt in the entire world.

The geopolitical importance of Ukraine is undisputed. Already Zbigniew Brzezinski has written: Ukraine has a great importance on the European chessboard. It is a crucial geopolitical pivot. And: without Ukraine, Russia is no longer an empire (2).

Therefore, over the last 30 years, the USA has pursued a policy aimed at bringing Ukraine under absolute American domination. On the part of the USA, everything was done to bring Ukraine

into NATO. This was seen by Russia as a humiliation and a threat to its own security. In the process, the U.S. has largely challenged, and in any case accepted, a war over Ukraine.

3. *Why has the New World Order led to crises and wars, including the one in Ukraine?*

What is a world order? All those questions that are regulated domestically by a constitution are determined internationally within the framework of a world order, i.e.: Who has what competences? How is power divided up? What rules are there? Who determines these rules?

The U.S. totally won the Cold War: 1989 saw the fall of the Berlin Wall; 1991 saw the collapse of the Soviet Union. The victory of the West was absolute. President Bush (father) then proclaimed the New World Order to document the absolute supremacy of the USA. The latter could now determine when and where wars would be fought. Who may govern where; otherwise a "regime change" was initiated. Also which social order a country was allowed to have; if necessary, American troops marched in to carry out "nation-building".

Then came two developments that were to bring about opposing constellations of power: globalization and the dominance of the neoconservatives. Globalization led to countries that had previously been on the margins of the world economy becoming economically stronger; the so-called BRICS. This became the basis for a multipolar world, that is, a world with multiple centers of power.

At the same time, the neoconservatives made their breakthrough as the determining force in American foreign policy. Their central demand was: the U.S. must do everything to remain the sole leading power in the world and, if necessary, enforce this claim by military means. These two developments were bound to collide.

As far as globalization is concerned, China in particular became an economic world power; the USA, although initially the driving force of globalization, became relatively weaker. After World War II, for example, the U.S. alone produced 60% of the world's economic output; by 2020, it was only 16%. Over the same period, China's share of world GDP rose from 2% to 18.6% (purchasing power adjusted). Shares of global exports showed a similar trend: in 1948, 21.6% of exports came from the United States, not even one percent from China. In 2021, by contrast, China's share of global exports was already 15 percent, while that of the United States was only 7.9 percent. The share of the BRICS countries in global exports was already 31.6% in 2021. Even the dollar as a reserve currency has suffered losses. While 77% of all currency reserves were invested in dollars in 1970, this figure had fallen to 51% by 2019.

Europe and North America's share of the world population has declined dramatically. Around 1900, a third of the world's population lived in these two regions; in 2021, they each accounted for just over 4%.

In addition to these economic and demographic changes, a new political constellation also emerged. Russia has consolidated strongly since 2000 under the new president Vladimir Putin, and the chaotic years following the collapse of the Soviet Union have been overcome. In the process, Moscow has also sought to participate in the reorganization of Europe and joined the Council of Europe in 1996.

All these developments show one thing: Globalization means that we increasingly live in a multipolar world. As a result, the power of the USA has relatively declined. Nevertheless, America wants to maintain its sole claim to power and assert its interests worldwide, if necessary also militarily.

Why have the neoconservatives prevailed so decisively in Washington? Why have they become so strong? One reason is undoubtedly that the exponents of this movement have come from both the left and the right of the political spectrum, in some cases even from the far left. At the same time, they have exerted a strong influence within both the Democratic and Republican parties.

They have also developed comprehensive foreign policy theory in publications and think tanks. And above all, they have succeeded in putting these theories into practice.

Even in the days when President Jimmy Carter called for worldwide recognition of democracy and human rights in his speeches and programs, Paul Wolfowitz, Richard Perle or Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson demanded that these values not only be proclaimed, but also enforced through active intervention. The 2003 invasion of Iraq was then a prime example of the implementation of this ideology.

The neoconservatives have become extremely active, especially in their own think tanks and with a number of publications. Irvine Kristol and George Will were successful authors; think tanks such as the Heritage Foundation or the American Enterprise Institute contributed significantly to the expansion of the "Military-Industrial Complex" into a "Military-Industrial-Media Complex." They all proclaimed the same goal: the U.S. must be militarily strong and the sole leading power in the world.

The neoconservatives were not just theorists; they succeeded in determining their country's foreign policy and strategy, as expressed in the following landmark documents:

- In 1992, the "Defense Policy Guidance" was adopted. It states that the U.S. must assert a military leadership that cannot be challenged by anyone in the world. There must be no new rivals. Thus, the U.S. does not need allies, but only respective ad hoc support, i.e. vassals.
- In 1996, the "National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement" was adopted. According to this strategy, the security of the USA must be based on its military strength and it must also be prepared to fight for it.
- In 2002, a new "National Security Strategy" was adopted. Under the motto "Freedom, Democracy and Free Enterprise," this doctrine states that it must also be possible to wage preventive wars.

4. *The new order in Europe was established against Russia*

As part of this overall strategy, the new order in Europe was built by the US against Russia. In fact, since the end of the Cold War, the US has expanded its sphere of influence in Europe by 1.5 million km²; over an additional 150 million people. Treaties with Russia, such as the ABM Treaty, have been unilaterally terminated, as has the INF Treaty on Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces.

Most crucially, NATO's eastward expansion has been pushed to Russia's borders, breaking all the promises made in connection with the unification of Germany. Missiles have been deployed on the Russian border and Ukraine has been upgraded. George Kennan once called this the "greatest mistake of Western policy." Whatever justification is given by the West for this course of action, Russia regards NATO's eastward expansion as a threat to its own security. In 1999, Serbia, a country friendly to Russia, was bombed for months against all rules of international law by 1200 NATO planes flying 800 sorties a day. This, too, was considered by Moscow to be a major breach of trust.

In December 2021, President Putin proposed negotiations on security guarantees for Russia. Ukraine should not become a NATO member; the number of NATO troops in Eastern Europe should be limited; the USA should withdraw its nuclear weapons from Europe. On the part of the West, these proposals were not even discussed.

American foreign policy, however, was not only directly directed against Russia; attempts were also made to align the governments of neighboring countries against Moscow. The American ambassador Michael McFaul, one had the impression, was accredited more with opposition groups than with the government in Moscow, and countless NGOs were financed in neighboring countries to support American policy. Thus came the "color revolutions": in Georgia in 2003; in Ukraine in 2004; and in Kyrgyzstan the following year.

Professional revolutionaries were sent from one country to another. These movements were financed by institutions such as the International Republican Institute, the National Endowment for Democracy, Freedom House, George Soros, and countless others.

Moreover, for years the U.S. has done everything possible to drive a wedge between Russia and Western Europe. One of the main goals was to prevent the commissioning of Nord Stream2 or to minimize relations with Moscow. Washington made use of the resentment that exists between Eastern Europeans and Balts toward Russia. Instead of trying to bring about a reconciliation, as had been achieved between Germany and France after World War II, the antagonisms were heated up.

With the slogan "Your fight is our fight," top American politicians traveled to these countries time and again. For the USA, these allies from the "new Europe" brought many advantages. For example, George Friedman stated: by binding Poland to the USA, Russian forces are bound; Europe is divided; the European Union is weakened (4).

This isolation of Russia must be seen in an international context. On the other hand, as early as 1823, the USA decreed in the "Monroe Doctrine" that no European power had the right to interfere on the American continent. During the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962, President Kennedy very clearly threatened to use nuclear weapons. And when China made an agreement a few months ago with the Solomon Islands, which are, after all, 10,000 km from Los Angeles, it was considered a "threat to national security" by Washington.

On the other hand, it is precisely American interests that are to be enforced worldwide, with Ukraine occupying a special place. This total American domination is now seen as obsolete by other countries. Economically strengthened by globalization, they increasingly want to represent their own national interests (5).

5. *Three political observations on the Ukraine war*

- The annexation of the four districts of Luhansk, Donetsk, Zaporizhzhya and Kherson may lead to a new military dimension of the war. Moscow considers these territories to be part of the Russian Federation. An attack on this territory allows-according to Russian military doctrine-a nuclear counterattack.

- The USA has totally won the information war in the West. We are presented only the Ukrainian side of the events, journalists became activists. Pierre Conesa in his book "Vendre la Guerre" wrote the following about the essence of war propaganda: each side proclaims "We do not want this war!". "The enemy alone is responsible for the war".

The enemy has the face of the devil, so Putin is equated with Hitler. As the emphasis on "values" in this war shows, the West is fighting for the good, while the enemy is committing terrible war crimes and also using prohibited weapons. The losses of the Ukrainian army are minimized, while the Russian losses are presented as terrible.

Artists and intellectuals are used for their own cause; anyone who is not for it is, of course, a traitor (6). Crucially, the "military-industrial complex" has been supplemented by the "media complex.

- The economic war has reached a new dimension. Currently, 8000 American sanctions are imposed on states, companies and individuals around the world, with Russia being the most affected. In this area, too, Brussels has obviously lost all sovereignty vis-à-vis Washington. While peace policy has been a characteristic of the EU since the beginning of European unification, Europe is now trying to outdo the USA in economic warfare. Obviously, too little consideration is given to the fact that Russia was economically much more closely linked to the rest of Europe than North America.

With this attitude of leading politicians of the EU, one is reminded of the saying "States do not die by murder, but by suicide". If an oligarch loses his yacht, he can still live well. But the tens of thousands of Russians who worked in foreign companies and lost their jobs might have been the basis of a possible democratic development as a middle class. It is precisely this population group that has been hit hardest with the sanctions.

6. *What could be the next step?*

The U.S. has achieved its war aims: Russia has been severely weakened; Europe has been relegated to a vassal role; and Ukraine remains under absolute American domination.

As far as Russia's future is concerned, many things are possible: Vladimir Putin may emerge from the conflict stronger; but there may also be a "regime change," followed by economic chaos and tendencies for the country to disintegrate.

Europe is already suffering massively from the sanctions. The question is how far economic difficulties will lead to social protests. It is safe to assume that Europeans will have to pay for the reconstruction of Ukraine; President Zelenskyy has already made demands to the tune of \$57 billion.

Due to the successes of the USA, voices are already being raised in America, such as those of Yale professor Stephen Kotkin, who demand that the approach practiced against Russia also be used against China. In crucial areas, this has already begun: the Chinese government is being

diabolized, with human rights being used as a weapon. China is surrounded by dozens of American military bases and Taiwan is being rearmed.

The New World Order proclaimed a generation ago has thus led to polarization, which ultimately also became the cause of the war in Ukraine. The outcome of this war will be decisive for what the future world order will look like. It is not a question of whether the current American leadership role will be replaced by a Russian or Chinese one. Peace in the world would already be served if, in a world under American leadership, other countries were granted certain national interests. A Ukraine that belongs to the West and declares itself militarily neutral, along the lines of the Austrian model, could serve as an example of this.

(*) Dr. Wendelin Ettmayer; former Member of the National Council; Ambassador; Author; www.wendelinettmayer.at

Notes

- (1) Ray Dalio; The Changing World Order-Why Nations Succeed and Fail; Simon & Schuster; London 2021
- (2) Zbigniew Brezezinski; Strategic Visions: America and the Crisis of Global Power; Basic Books 2012
- (3) Kubilay Yado Arin; Think Tanks-The Brain Trust of US Foreign Policy; Springer 2014
- (4) George Friedman; Flash Points-Powder Barrel Europe; Plassen Verlag 2015
- (5) Klaus von Dohnanyi; National Interest Orientation of German and European Politics in Times of Global Upheaval; Munich 2022
- (6) Pierre Conesna; Vendre la Guerre; Edition de l'Aube 2022