

# Deterrence By Savagery?

By Moon Alabama – March, 2024

*The West's historical success was rooted in organized violence, rather than its proclaimed values.*



**“The West won the world not by the superiority of its ideas or values or religion (to which few members of other civilizations were converted) but rather by its superiority in applying organized violence. Westerners often forget this fact; non-Westerners never do.”**

Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (1996)

Western colonialism began in the fifteenth century and ended, with a few exceptions, in the mid of the 20th century. It was enabled by the development of technologies and fast population growth. The West then changed to a new model of ruling the world. It talked about human values and human rights and certain rules that would allegedly enable everyone to enjoy those.

The facade did not hold up well. The West, and especially the U.S., abused the ‘rules based order’ by circumventing international law whenever it did not fit its interests. It continued to apply ‘organized violence’ under dubious circumstances. The wars against Yugoslavia, Afghanistan and Iraq were supposed to demonstrate that the West would uphold whatever rules it claimed to exist. But the wars were lost and the U.S. had to retreat from them.

The war in Ukraine is only the latest but most obvious demonstration that the ‘rules based order’ no longer exists:

***Over the past several decades, the United States has continually placed Moscow in a position either to accept the fait accompli of NATO expansion at the expense of Russian security interests, or to escalate with force and suffer the consequences of increased economic and political ostracization. This disincentive to avoid escalation has been effectively removed. Explicating the altered state of international relations is not cheerleading for the Russian position — although it may be treated as such by those who disingenuously present any realistic assessment of the situation as “appeasement” — but rather illustrating how Moscow has insulated itself from Western ostracization, thus changing the entire balance of power in not only Europe, but the world.***

***Now, it is Russia that has the West on the horns of a dilemma: It can either watch the Kremlin achieve its strategic objectives, guaranteed in a one-sided negotiated settlement***

*or through the continued attrition of Ukrainian forces, or it can escalate with force. Putin's statement regarding nuclear weapons was not mere rhetoric—it was the Russian president defining the limits of the current conflict from a position of authority.*

*Anything short of total Ukrainian victory is therefore an implicit admission that the "rules-based" economic and political order has been irreversibly altered.*

This morning hypersonic weapons destroyed an SBU headquarter in Kiev just seconds after the air alarm was activated. Western air defenses had failed. Russia has destroyed the myth of the West's superiority in applying organized violence.

Others have taken note. The recent flare up in U.S. relations with Niger is a consequence of this:

*The pressure brought to Niger reveals that Washington is supporting the war against Russia for reasons other than the right of Ukraine to choose its partners and join NATO, or that that right only applies when the partner being chosen is the United States and NATO but not Russia. The core principle, then, is not the right of a sovereign nation to choose its partner, but the right of a sovereign nation to partner with the United States.*

*The American attitude toward Niger and Russia reveals a second lesson. A key response to the Russian invasion of Ukraine was to isolate Russia and reinforce the U.S.-led unipolar world. It has not worked.*

*The United States has expressed concern that the "Russian Federation is really trying to take over central Africa as well as the Sahel." Thurston told me that the U.S. is "very worried about Russian influence throughout the Sahel, and it has a particular sting in Niger given the previous closeness of the relationship."*

*He added that the United States "seems to regard competition with Russia in Africa as zero-sum; whereas, most African governments don't see things that way." And that is the hallmark of the emerging multipolar world that the U.S. is trying to hold back. Saudi Arabia has said "we do not believe in polarization or in choosing between sides." India's Minister of External Affairs, S. Jaishankar, in his book, *The Indian Way*, describes the new multipolar world as one in which countries deal "with contesting parties at the same time with optimal results" for their "own self-interest."*

Having lost its two main sources power, the rules based order as a (somewhat) soft power instrument and its military hard power superiority, the West is in need of a new instrument of deterrence, a new tool that allows it to press its interest against the will of other powers.

**It found that in demonstrating utter savagery.**

**The war on Gaza, backed by the West, is a demonstration that the West is willing to cross all lines. That it will discard any nuance of humanity. That it is willing to commit genocide. That it will do everything to prevent international organizations to intervene against this.**

That it is willing to eliminate everyone and everything that resists it.

Those nations who commit themselves to multi-polarity should steel themselves for what might be visited on them.