

# Giving Ukraine Missiles to Shoot Into Russia Is a Declaration of War

Congressman calls for direct strikes on Russia —House Foreign Affairs Committee chairman Michael McCaul shows a map of potential targets in Russia

By [Mike Whitney](#)

Global Research, June 16, 2024

Region: [Europe, Russia and FSU](#)

Theme: [Militarization and WMD](#), [US NATO War Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [UKRAINE REPORT](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name (only available in desktop version).

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

[Global Research Wants to Hear From You!](#)

First published on May 27, 2024

\*\*\*

*In a desperate attempt to stave off a humiliating defeat in Ukraine, "Secretary of State Antony Blinken has reportedly asked President Biden to greenlight Ukrainian missile strikes on targets deep inside Russia." **The change in policy will have no material impact on the ongoing ground war in Ukraine, although it could trigger a response that would put NATO in direct conflict with Moscow.** In short, Washington's looming defeat in Ukraine has compelled administration decisionmakers to implement a strategy that could precipitate a Third World War. This is from the New York Times:*

Since the first American shipments of sophisticated weapons to Ukraine, President Biden has never wavered on one prohibition: President Volodymyr Zelensky had to agree to never fire them into Russian territory, insisting that would violate Mr. Biden's mandate to "avoid World War III."

But the consensus around that policy is fraying. Propelled by the State Department, **there is now a vigorous debate inside the administration over relaxing the ban to allow the Ukrainians to hit missile and artillery launch sites just over the border in Russia** — targets that Mr. Zelensky says have enabled Moscow's recent territorial gains....

For months, Mr. Zelensky has been mounting attacks on Russian ships, oil facilities and

electricity plants, but he has been doing so largely with Ukrainian-made drones, which don't pack the power and speed of the American weapons... Now, the **pressure is mounting on the United States to help Ukraine target Russian military sites,... with American-provided arms....**

The United States is now considering training Ukrainian troops inside the country, rather than sending them to a training ground in Germany. **That would require putting American military personnel in Ukraine**, something else that Mr. Biden has prohibited until now. It raises the question of how the United States would respond if the trainers, who would likely be based near the western city of Lviv, came under attack. The Russians have periodically targeted Lviv, though it is distant from the main areas of combat....

The Russians... have been unsubtle in playing to American concerns about an escalation of the war. This week **they began very public exercises with the units that would be involved in the use of tactical nuclear weapons**, the kind that would be used on Ukrainian troops. Russian news reports said it was "a response to provocative statements and threats from Western officials against Russia."...

The current exercises... are being dismissed as bluster and muscle-flexing....

In his interview with the *Times*, Mr. Zelensky dismissed fears of escalation, saying President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia had already escalated the war. And he thought it unlikely that Mr. Putin would ever make good on his threat to unleash a nuclear weapon.... [Inside the White House, a Debate Over Letting Ukraine Shoot U.S. Weapons Into Russia](#), *New York Times*

Let's not mince words: **Missile attacks on Russian territory is a flagrant act of aggression against the Russian Federation. It is an open declaration of war.** The Biden administration is committing to a policy that will pit the United States against Russia in a war between two nuclear superpowers.

Why? Why is Biden doing this?

He's doing this because the US is heavily invested in the outcome of the war in Ukraine, and Ukraine is losing the war quite badly. Here's a short recap from combat veteran and military analyst Colonel Daniel Davis:

Trust me when I tell you that **there is no chance that Ukraine will ever succeed in a war against Russia. There is no path to military victory for Ukraine. Period.** It doesn't matter whether we give them \$60 billion or \$120 billion or \$200 billion. It won't change anything, because the foundations on which the fighting power at the national level is built are irrevocably on the side of Russia. You can't reverse the tide because you can't change the basics.

**Air power is on Russia's side, air defense is on Russia's side, military-industrial potential is on Russia's side, enabling the production of a large amount of artillery, ammunition, the weapons themselves, drones, electronic warfare equipment and, above all, people are all on Russia's side.** Russia has more people and will always have more people... In my opinion, it is unreasonable to continue to hope that the Ukrainian side will be able to win if we give just a little more

money, because it will not work....**UKRAINE WILL NEVER WIN....Period.** Retired US Army Lt. Col. Daniel Davis: I have over 20 years of military combat experience. [Daniel Davis@peacemaker71](mailto:DanielDavis@peacemaker71)

Not surprisingly, Davis's views are shared by the vast majority of military experts who have been closely following events on the ground. The overall assessment of these experts is invariably the same: **Ukraine is losing, and losing badly. There won't be any reversal of momentum because—in every area of combat capability—Russia has a clear advantage.** Ukraine doesn't have the firepower, the aircraft, the tanks, the armored vehicles, the missiles, the heavy artillery, the air-defense systems, the munitions, the industrial capacity or the manpower to roll back the Russian army or to even stop the persistent Russian offensive. **Simply put, Ukraine cannot and will not win. And,** this is not just the view of men like Davis who think the fighting should stop immediately. It is also the view of globalist elites, like Richard Haass, who think the war should be prolonged. Haass is the president emeritus of the prestigious Council On Foreign Relations, and his views on Ukraine are likely shared by a large cross-section of wealthy elites who think there is something to gain by dragging the conflict out for another year or so. Take a look at this excerpt from a recent article by Haass and see if you can spot the similarities between his analysis and Davis':

**...what should Ukraine and its backers in the West seek to achieve? What should constitute success?**

Some answer that success should be defined as Ukraine recovering all of its lost territory, to re-establish its 1991 borders.... This would be a serious mistake. Don't get me wrong: re-establishing rightful, legal borders would be highly desirable, demonstrating that aggression is not acceptable. But foreign policy must be doable as well as desirable, and Ukraine is simply not in a position to liberate Crimea and its eastern regions through military force.

The maths is unavoidable. **Russia has too many soldiers and a wartime economy capable of producing large amounts of arms and ammunition. Despite sanctions, Russia has been able to ramp up its military-industrial base and has access to weaponry and ammunition** produced in Iran and North Korea and to Chinese manufactured goods and technologies that contribute to the Kremlin's war effort.

Another factor militating against a Ukraine effort to recapture its lands by force is that offensive operations tend to require much more in the way of manpower, equipment, and ammunition than do defensive efforts. This is especially so when defences have had the chance to build fortifications, as Russia has in much of the Ukrainian territory it occupies. [Why Mounting another Counteroffensive in 2025 would be a Mistake](#), *Novaya Gazeta*

So, Haass openly admits that the war is a mismatch and that Ukraine cannot reasonably expect to retake the territory it has lost. He admits that "Russia has too many soldiers" (unlimited manpower) "a wartime economy capable of producing large amounts of arms and ammunition" (Unlimited industrial capacity) and "Russia... has access to weaponry and ammunition... that contribute to the Kremlin's war effort." (Unlimited weapons production) In short, Haass's analysis is identical to Davis's. **They both agree on the fundamentals, that is, that Ukraine cannot and will not win.**

But then the article takes an unusual turn, in which, Haass inexplicably draws the exact opposite conclusions from his analysis than Davis. It is an astonishing rhetorical sleight-of-hand that would make Svengali envious. Here's what says after listing the numerous reasons why Ukraine will not win the war:

**“Some answer that success should be defined as Ukraine recovering all of its lost territory, to re-establish its 1991 borders.... This would be a serious mistake.”**

Think about that for a minute. So, according to Haass—winning the war no longer means winning the war. It does not mean retaking captured territory, it does not mean expelling the Russians from eastern Ukraine, and it does not mean prevailing in the ground war. It means, ‘what’ exactly?

Haass explains:

“What strategy... should Ukraine and its supporters pursue? First, Ukraine should emphasise the defensive, an approach that would allow it to husband its limited resources and frustrate Russia.

Second, **Ukraine should be given the means — long-range strike capabilities — and the freedom to attack Russian forces anywhere in Ukraine, as well as Russian warships in the Black Sea and economic targets within Russia itself.** Russia must come to feel the cost of a war it initiated and prolongs.

Third, Ukraine's backers must commit to providing long-term military aid. The goal of all of the above is to signal to Vladimir Putin that time is not on Russia's side and that he cannot hope to outlast Ukraine. [Why Mounting another Counteroffensive in 2025 would be a Mistake](#), *Novaya Gazeta*

So, this is the new strategy? This is Plan B?

Yes, apparently. And look at what Plan B involves:

1. Hunkering down in a defensive posture
2. **Using “long-range strike capabilities” to attack targets in Russia** (Is this where Blinken got the idea?)
3. Pumping billions more into the Ukrainian ‘black hole’ to prolong a war that cannot be won.

In short, provoke, hector and inflict as much pain as possible on Russia for as long as it takes.

As long as what takes? What does that mean?

Haass explains that too:

An interim ceasefire almost certainly would not lead to anything resembling peace, which **will likely have to wait for the arrival of a Russian leadership that chooses to end the country's pariah status.** That might not happen for years or decades.

Oh, so the real objective, is regime change. What a surprise!

This is more than just “moving the goalposts” (by changing the definition of “winning” a war). **This is a revelation of the elite agenda**, which looks beyond the fatuous propaganda about “unprovoked aggression” and focuses entirely on geopolitics, the driving force in international relations. In Haass’s mind, Ukraine is not a battlefield on which Ukrainian and Russian patriots sacrifice their lives for their countries. No. In Haass’s mind, **Ukraine is the critical gateway to Central Asia which is expected to be the most prosperous region of the next century. Western plutocrats intend to be the main players in Central Asia’s development,(pivot to Asia) which is why they are trying to remove the biggest obstacle to western penetration, which is Russia.** Once Russia has been weakened and rolled-back, Washington will be free to spread its military bases across Eurasia laying the groundwork for containing rival China through provocations, encirclement and economic strangulation.

That is why Haass’s definition of “success” is more flexible than ordinary people who evaluate these matters in terms of the enormous human suffering they cause. In the globalist view, these things are only of secondary importance. What really matters is power; raw, geopolitical power in the form of **global hegemony. That is the ultimate strategic objective. Nothing else matters.**

And that is why the Biden administration is about to approve the use of American-made long-range strike weapons to destroy targets on Russian territory. Because—even though it does not increase Ukraine’s chances of winning the war—it does **help to advance the globalist geopolitical agenda which regards Ukraine as a mere springboard for launching attacks on Russia.**

The elites are so drunk with hubris, they have convinced themselves that Putin will not see these missile-strikes on Russian territory as a declaration of war. Which they are.

\*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

*This article was originally published on [The Unz Review](#).*

*Michael Whitney is a renowned geopolitical and social analyst based in Washington State. He initiated his career as an independent citizen-journalist in 2002 with a commitment to honest journalism, social justice and World peace.*

*He is a Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG).*

*Featured image is from TUR*

The original source of this article is Global Research  
Copyright © [Mike Whitney](#), Global Research, 2024

---

**[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)**

## **Become a Member of Global Research**

Articles by: [Mike Whitney](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)