The Military Cavalry of US Ambassadors in CIS is Increasing

Nowadays, it comes as no surprise that US policy is becoming more militaristic with each passing day.

We can see this by the approaches the White House takes toward resolving domestic policy issues, and the forceful methods adopted by the American police in confronting people, and not only the country’s black population.

This is also clearly evident in Washington’s aggressive pressure on governments and countries it finds objectionable, which in recent years has begun to be expressed not in solving emerging conflicts through debate, but in imposing sanctions and using the capabilities of American military forces in various regions. And this is all occurring along with statements made by the head of the White House to lull the public concerning its alleged intentions to bring an end to the ceaseless wars that US Armed Forces participate in, such as the one made by D. Trump at a recent pre-election rally in Dayton (state of Ohio), but without any pivotal manifestations of these intentions actually arising.

Last but not least, openly militaristic tactics began to actively surface in the activities performed by the US Department of State, and in the speeches given by its current head Mike Pompeo, who forgot upon being appointed that it is not a branch of the Pentagon or the CIA, but a foreign policy and diplomacy agency. Therefore, it would not be superfluous to recall the words spoken by Dennis Jett, a professor of international relations at Pennsylvania State University, who emphasized that in any other well-developed, democratic country the role of ambassador, with very rare exceptions, is allotted to professional diplomats that have studied the art of international relations for decades. However, in the United States, many “extraordinary” and “plenipotentiary” diplomats are simply not trained in diplomacy. But it is just these kinds of agencies in all countries that are proud of their career diplomats, who are ready at any moment to participate not from a position of strength, but to help diplomatically settle disputes between countries, and by doing so removing the dangers of wars and armed confrontations.

Recently, Washington has begun to view foreign policy as one of the arenas to prepare for wars and confrontations, by virtue of which the current US elite hopes to “rejuvenate the national economy” and receive additional profits from defense orders. This is the source of the clear trend in Washington in recent years of not sending career diplomats to foreign missions in many countries, especially to those that interest the US in terms of natural resources and their strategic location, but rather military personnel, or people that have extensive personal experience in laying the groundwork for “color revolutions”, and in whipping up social and political conflict that is conducive to Washington’s interests in various countries. On top of that, this kind of trend has been observed in the US for several years, despite the fact that back on October 30, 2019, US House of Representatives member Ami Beri (a Democrat from California) introduced a bill that proposed requiring at least 70% of the president’s ambassadorial appointments to be career diplomats and civil servants.

However, the situation persists nonetheless. That is why in recent years in international media reports materials come up more frequently about American ambassadors but, unfortunately, they do not stand out in how they praise their humanitarian activities, but more often speak about the truly aggressive countenance that they take on. In this regard, should it come as any surprise that there is increasing, ubiquitous antipathy, and not only in relation to Washington’s foreign policy but also the frank criticism leveled at the activities of American ambassadors in recent years in many countries?

Previously, NEO reported on the patently obvious trend with how the White House selects US ambassadors for Central Asia, which demonstrates that it sends people there with extensive experience in strategic military issues and staging government coups d’etat. Kelly Degnan, the recently appointed US ambassador to Georgia, possesses...
And now the process of appointing retired Lieutenant General Keith Dayton, another representative from US military circles, as a US ambassador - and this time to Ukraine - is virtually officially completed. It is quite understandable that taking into account his military and combat experience he is supposed to intensify confrontation with Russia, which includes the form of hybrid war between the United States and Russia that has been launched from inside Ukrainian borders. Although he is not a great Ukrainian specialist, nonetheless we should not forget that the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies, which he directed, was exactly where hundreds of Ukrainians received training, with many of them now in high positions in the Ukrainian public administration system.

By appointing this former military leader, the White House hopes that using a “strong military hand” will increase the ability of the US to externally control the activities and processes that the United States is overseeing in Ukraine, review America’s “contacts” there, and increase the military use of this country against Russia. Moreover, preparatory work by Washington has already been executed in the form of an unprecedented flight made by American B-52 strategic nuclear bombers over Ukraine in early September, holding joint exercises, and numerous attempts made by the Pentagon to breach Russia’s defense from the south. What will allow Dayton to accomplish controlling Ukraine externally is the experience that he has already gained in this regard after he was appointed in November 2018 by former US Secretary of Defense James Mattis as a US defense adviser to Ukraine, and including the American as part of a reform committee under the Ukrainian Ministry of Defense and General Staff of the Ukrainian Armed Forces.

It has to stated, however, that Dayton completely failed in his “advisory functions” during the five-day war in 2008, when he acted as an unofficial adviser to the then-president of Georgia Mikhail Saakashvili, and helped him develop a strategy on how to “defeat Russia”. It is commonly known that after Georgia, on advice from Washington, opened fire on Tskhinvali and tried to establish control over the entire region of South Ossetia, Russian troops then entered the region and began an operation to force the Georgian invaders to the peace table, and this reckless military scheme by Saakashvili completely failed.
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