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Notes From The Chairman:
Greetings from the Department of Political Science; thank you for taking the time to read our Newsletter. The Department has been especially active since issuance of our previous Newsletter in Spring 2013, as detailed in the following pages. Particularly significant has been the Department’s central role in the establishment of the Institute for Leadership and Democracy, with Professor Richard Powell serving as Director; the promotion of professors Richard Powell and Mark Brewer to the rank of Professor of Political Science; Dr. Mark Brewer receiving the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Outstanding Faculty Award in Teaching/Advising, and International Affairs-POS major Ms. Ariel Bothen being named the Outstanding Graduating Senior for the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. Professor Robert W. Glover won the Donald Harward Award for Service-Learning Excellence, for which he was recognized at the Maine Statehouse on April 30. The Department has also coordinated the establishment of the Dr. John M. Nickerson faculty-student lounge on the second floor of North Stevens Hall; the lounge is part of a very generous bequest to the University of Maine Foundation by Dr. Nickerson, in honor of his parents. Our exceptionally able and effective Administrative Assistant, Ms. Deborah Grant, was named Outstanding Classified Employee for 2014. Many who will read this Newsletter will recall with fondness and gratitude the services rendered by Ms. Grant; we in the Department are endlessly grateful for her outstanding work and her unflagging devotion to our entire operation, and most particularly to our students. On behalf of the entire faculty and staff of the Department of Political Science, may you have an enjoyable, safe, and relaxing summer in 2014.

- James W. Warhola, Professor and Chairman

Faculty News:

Dr. Mark Brewer will be promoted to Professor of Political Science as of September 1, 2014. Mark Brewer has won the 2014 College of Liberal Arts and Sciences Outstanding Faculty Award in Teaching/Advising. He attended the Advocates and Allies Workshop for Gender Equality on
Campus, led by faculty from North Dakota State University, March 2014. He participated in the Communications Training Workshop, Alan Alda Center for Communicating Science, Stony Brook University, March 2014. He also served as a judge for Maine National History Day on the University of Maine campus on April 12.

Howard Cody presented “Australian Senate Lessons for Trinidad and Tobago” to the Life support Initiative Impact on Governance Conference, Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago. In March 2014 he served as a country expert on Canada for the University of Gothenburg and the University of Notre Dame’s Varieties of Democracy Project to establish the world’s largest dataset on democracy. Cody serves as Editor of the Canadian-American Public Policy occasional paper series and as Director of the University of Maine’s International Affairs program.

Timothy Cole co-taught the 2014 Camden Conference course on "The Global Politics of Food and Water." He currently is serving as Associate Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences.

Amy Fried continues to engage with the schools and the public. In June 2013, she delivered the keynote address to the Maine state convention of the League of Women Voters. Fried sat on a mock Senate Foreign Relations Committee panel and questioned Hampden Academy students about different options with regard to upheaval in the Central African Republican. Her research on the history of public opinion studies was featured on the Australian Radio Show "Rear Vision." Fried's Pollways blog at the Bangor Daily News was awarded second place as best news blog by the Maine Press Association. She also published two op-eds on the impact of the Affordable Care Act for women with Rep. Jan Schakowsky of Illinois.

Robert Glover is currently teaching POS 362 – Maine Government, a course that had not been taught in the department in several years. As part of the course, numerous prominent guest speakers have been brought in to discuss their experience in Maine politics with the students. Thus far this year, the students have gotten to discuss Maine Politics with Former Maine Attorney General James Tierney, Former State Legislators Mary Cathcart and Chris Rector, and two-time gubernatorial candidate and current head of the Maine Turnpike Authority, Peter Mills. Professor Glover has also been named as a recipient of the Donald Harward Faculty Award for Service-Learning Excellence, an honor given annually by the organization Maine Campus Compact to educators who “make public service an integral part of their teaching.”

Paul Holman is offering a new course, as INA 201: North Africa and the Arab Spring. He continues to coordinate our inter-departmental Camden Conference Course, which this year addressed the global politics of food and water.
Michael Palmer has been awarded a grant from the Charles Koch Foundation to help fund his Guest Speaker series in academic year 2014-15 in the UM Program in Western Civilization and American Liberty of which he is the Founding Director. Also, he attended the 20th Annual Meeting of the Association for Core Texts and Courses in Los Angeles, April 11-14.

Richard Powell will be promoted to Professor of Political Science as of September 1, 2014. Richard Powell, along with other members of the Department, have been working on the development of the new interdisciplinary Institute for Leadership and Democracy, of which the political science department will be a central partner. The Institute’s mission will be to train future generations of impactful leaders to be ethical, visionary, innovative, civil, thoughtful, and independent-minded in the service of Maine, the United States, and the world. External fundraising is currently underway for the Institute as part of President Ferguson’s Blue Sky Plan. Please contact Professor Powell (rpowell@maine.edu, 207-581-1795) with any questions or suggestions about the Institute’s development. Related to the Institute, the political science department is working with other departments on the new interdisciplinary Leadership Studies minor. Professors Powell and Brewer are currently teaching an innovative new course on leadership that will serve as a core course in the minor.

Seth Singleton and James W. Warhola participated in a panel discussion entitled "The Current Crisis in Ukraine" on Saturday, April 19 at The Graduate School of the University of Maine; the event was sponsored by the Maine Chapter of the Fulbright Association. Professor Singleton spoke on "Western Policies and Responses to the Ukraine Events" and Professor Warhola spoke on "US-Russian Relations in the Wake of Crimea." Dr. Singleton also led a one day symposium on the Middle East at the Belfast Senior College in February. Singleton has rejoined the Board of Directors of the Camden Conference.


Faculty Publications:

Books/monographs:
Stefano Tijerina, is the author of Filling in the Gaps in the Americas: Canada and Colombia, 1767-1968. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. (Under contract, under peer review; scheduled publication 2014).
Journal Articles, Book Chapters:


Robert W. Glover is the author of two forthcoming book chapters. The first, “Neither Here Nor There: The Conceptual Paradoxes of Immigrant Asylee Resistance” will appear in the edited volume The Aporia of Human Rights (Bloomsbury Academic). The collection is comprised of scholarly work presented at a scholarly workshop at the Whitlam Institute in Sydney, Australia at which he was an invited participant. The second chapter (co-authored with Mike Howard in the University of Maine Philosophy Department) is entitled “A Carrot, Not a Stick: Examining the Potential Role of Basic Income in U.S. Immigration Policy.” The chapter will be part of an edited volume entitled A Basic Income Guarantee in North American? Comparing Political Opportunities in Canada and the United States (Palgrave MacMillan). In addition, Professor Glover published “Choice, Power, and Perspective: The Neglected Question of Who Initiates Campus-Community Partnerships” in Gateways: International Journal of Community Research and Engagement. The article is co-authored with Linda Silka, Director of the Margaret Chase Smith Policy Center.

Michael J. Palmer has had a refereed book chapter accepted for publication in a forthcoming volume in honor of the 70th birthday of the world-renowned political theorist and expert on Thucydides, Clifford Orwin. The chapter is entitled, "The Spartan Alcibiades: Brasidas and Regime Change in Sparta." He has also been invited by Oxford University Press to submit a chapter on "Stasis (Civil War or Revolution) in Thucydides' History of the Peloponnesian War" for the forthcoming Oxford Handbook on Thucydides.


Other Publications:


Alumni News

Justin Lynch ’13 is currently in Washington, DC working for the New America Foundation and was formerly with the organization POMED – Project on Middle East Democracy. Justin has written an article that was featured on the Foreign Affairs Mid-East Channel, talking about a letter to President Obama, urging him to discuss political reform in Bahrain during a recent meeting in Saudi Arabia - http://pomed.org/pomed/experts-call-on-president-obama-to-discuss-reform-in-bahrain-during-visit-to-saudi-arabia/. Lynch recently wrote an Op-ed in the BDN - http://globalfocus.bangordailynews.com/2014/03/30/us-should-use-egypt-military-aid-to-force-crucial-reforms-angus-king-should-lend-his-support/. In addition he spoke at the United Nations, during the Commission on the Status of Women on impact of social media on gender equality in Egypt on 3/17/14 at a talk entitled “Global Solutions for Gender Equality.”

Jennifer Stoudt ’12 has been accepted to Brown University’s Urban Education Policy Program to pursue the MA degree.

POS Department Alumni are encouraged to visit our website and add information via our alumni contact form: http://umaine.edu/polisci/alumniawinitiatives/; you may also see what other alumni are up to in our “After UMaine” section, http://umaine.edu/polisci/after-umaine/.

Departmental News

In October 2013, the department hosted Prof. Nicholas Carnes of Duke University, who visited classes and presented a campus-wide talk related to his book, "White Collar Government: The Hidden Role of Class in Economic Policy Making." In February 2014, the department hosted Alexander Hertel-Fernandez, a Ph.D. candidate in Government at Harvard University whose research concerns ALEC, the American Legislative Exchange Council.

Outstanding Senior Awards are presented annually to two graduating seniors with the highest grade point average within their discipline.

The recipient of the Outstanding Senior Award in International Affairs/Political Science for 2014 is Ariel Bothen.
Celina K. Bernhardt, a senior in political science was selected by the Department to attend The 65th Annual Student Conference on U.S. Affairs (SCUSA) in West Point, NY, October 30 through November 2, 2013. The theme of the conference was “Navigating Demographic Flows: Populations, Power, and Policy”.

The Peter T. Madigan Congressional Internship Program at the University of Maine

It is with great enthusiasm that the Department of Political Science renamed its long-standing Congressional Internship Program in honor of Peter Madigan (Class of 1981). Mr. Madigan participated in the program as an intern during his days as a student at UMaine and has since gone on to a highly successful career in Washington D.C. Among many other things, he served as a high-ranking assistant to Secretary of State James A. Baker III and as Chief of Staff to U.S. Trade Representative Robert B. Zoellick. He is now a partner with the Washington D.C.-based lobbying firm of Johnson, Madigan, Peck, Boland & Stewart.

This semester we have five interns working in Washington DC: Jackson Pineau, Ashley Sidney, Braden Sinclair, Katie Coyne, and Jake Dumas.

POS Department Commentaries on Current Events

"Yet Another Campaign Finance Law Falls: 'Here's Winking At You, Kid'."

Solomon Goldman, J.D.
Adjunct Professor of Political Science

Chief Justice John Roberts missed by one day. April Fool’s Day would have been the perfect time to release the latest Supreme Court decision striking down a campaign finance law; instead, the Court waited until April 2nd. But the joke’s still on us.

The plaintiff in the case was Shaun McCutcheon of Birmingham, Alabama, just an ordinary CEO of an engineering firm that specializes in the mining industry, who’s not asking any favors of any
politicians. He just wanted to contribute money to federal political candidates and political action committees and party committees. The problem was that he wanted to contribute more to various candidates and committees than the $123,000 that the law allowed him in total ("aggregate") contributions. (There are still “base” limits on contributions to individual candidates and committees, but the aggregate limit was intended to prevent evasion of those limits.)

The basic structure of constitutional limits on campaign finance laws goes back to the 1976 case of Buckley v. Valeo. There, the Court divided the world into two spheres, limits on contributions (like the ones that so irked Mr. McCutcheon) and limits on spending. Contribution limits had an easier time passing constitutional muster than spending limits, because direct contributions have more potential to look like you’re buying yourself a politician.

The government can restrict contributions, and thus restrict free speech, in order to prevent “corruption”. The McCutcheon opinion tells us what corruption means. Does it mean the corrosive influence of money in politics? No! Does it mean buying influence with a politician? No! Does it mean buying access to politicians? No! There is only one form of corruption that our government can regulate: “quid pro quo” corruption, meaning the crime of being caught trading money for political favors. But the contribution joined with the wink is free speech, not a crime.

Here’s the best part: Remember the Citizens United case? That one dealt with the other side of the divide, the spending side, and it got rid of limits on corporate spending. Together with a few other rulings, it led to the creation of superPACs, in which unlimited amounts of spending can take place, as long as it’s not “coordinated” with the candidate (like when Texas Governor’s campaign chief resigned that position and set up a superPAC that didn’t coordinate with candidate Perry. Good one.)

Well, why wasn’t the aggregate limit constitutional? Because it isn’t necessary. And why isn’t it necessary? Because, said Roberts, if you want to buy yourself a politician, you’d do it through unlimited superPAC spending, not through limited contributions to politicians. Get it? Since they blasted a huge hole out of campaign finance in allowing superPAC spending, the remaining restrictions on contributions are unnecessary, and therefore unconstitutional too.

One more good one: Roberts reminded us that this decision is good for us all, because it protects the rights of all of us to free speech, the “lone pamphleteer” as well as someone who spends “substantial amounts of money in order to communicate his political ideas through sophisticated means”. This is really just a variation of a saying by Anatole France in 1894: “The law, in its majestic equality, forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets and to steal bread.” So now we’re all free to spend millions, says Roberts.

April Fools.....

____________________________________

"Student Perspectives on Maine Politics."
Robert W. Glover, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Political Science and Honors

In Spring Semester 2014, the Political Science Department offered the course POS 362-Maine Government for the first time in several years. I had the privilege of teaching it. The course had been dormant for a number of years since the retirement of our resident expert in Maine politics and former department chair, Kenneth Palmer. As part of the course, students maintained a web-based blog on a policy issue of their choice. Many of their weekly posts were of such high caliber that I suggested the students should submit them as opinion pieces to the major paper in the region, The Bangor Daily News. A number of these pieces were accepted and appeared both online and in print. Below are two such articles by Political Science students Trey Stewart and Liam Nee.
If people live an unhealthy lifestyle, should taxpayers pay their health care costs?
By Trey Stewart

Recent studies have shown that food may be the underlying problem of almost all health problems with Americans today.

In fact, by simply changing our diets now, we are more apt to avoid a plethora of medical problems in the future and, in some cases, even reverse the effects a disease may have already had on one’s body.

Most experts in food and nutritional science believe that the best way to treat health problems in America is to simply switch from a “Western” or “American Diet” (typically comprising meat and dairy products, high fat and sodium foods, and fast food), to a diet based on whole foods, non-refined fruit and vegetables.

The food we eat can have adverse affects on the development and growth of cancer within the body, according to a 2007 study published in the American Journal of Clinical Nutrition. The study found that in rats given a high animal-based protein diet (about 20 percent), the replication of cancer cells greatly increased. Conversely, in rats fed a diet of little to no animal protein (less than 5 percent) and fed more plant-based proteins, cancer cell activity could virtually be shut off at any stage.

Put simply, products high in animal proteins seem to grow cancer cells, while plant-based proteins stop cancer growth.

We also see a significant decrease in heart problems among those who consume plant-based proteins.

We need look no further than Norway during World War II to find a particularly useful example of this. Once the Nazis had taken over Norway, they confiscated most of their livestock, forcing the Norwegian people to switch from animal-based diets to ones that were more plant-based. The results were undeniable.

“Forks Over Knives,” a documentary film about human health and dieting, cites a study finding there was a clear decline in heart-related deaths from 1940 through 1944 when the Norwegians were forced to switch diets.

The U.S. spent about 17.6 percent of its gross domestic product on health care in 2010, according to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. Additionally, PBS Newshour reports that the U.S. spends nearly 2 ½ times the average amount on health care ($8,233 per person) compared with the 34 other wealthy nations that make up the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.

In the U.S., this is about more than our health. It’s about our wallets. Unfortunately, this money is often spent on procedures that are avoidable with a simple diet change.

You may be questioning why this is important to people in Maine.

In our state, MaineCare enrollment has doubled in the last decade, driving up the share of our state budget spent on health care. Maine is predicted to spend nearly $2.7 billion on health care in 2014 (roughly 25 percent of the entire state budget), according to the Office of Fiscal and Program Review.

With the recent increase of federal involvement in health care, the issue of unhealthy dieting is now one that will affect all Americans.

Should taxpayers have to pay the health care costs of unhealthy people who have neglected to maintain a healthy lifestyle and good, low-cholesterol diets?

If government spending is any indication, the government wants you to eat meat, poultry and high-fructose corn syrup products because it subsidizes these industries.

According to Food Safety News, major U.S. food companies spent about $40 million in 2011 to ensure Congressional endorsement of their...
industries through legislation. Americans need to realize that the current system is actually endorsing companies and programs that are harming (and in some cases killing) us, only to leave the taxpayers to pay the bills.

Hopefully, with the recent implementation of the Affordable Care Act, we will look more closely at what we are putting into our bodies and the surprising connections between government, the food industry and health care costs.

In Maine, health care and welfare reform will likely be central to upcoming election cycles. The potential subsidization of locally grown natural produce is one topic I would like to see included in debates about welfare, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families in Maine.

The organization Food AND Medicine has recently spearheaded this initiative, supplying a 50 percent discount on all produce from local farmers’ markets when paying with EBT Cards.

Would it not be wiser, then, to follow the advice of the ancient Greek philosopher Hippocrates and simply “let food be thy medicine”?

Food for thought ...

What’s in it for a recent college graduate to stay in Maine?
By Liam Nee

What’s in it for me?

That’s what many soon-to-be Maine college grads are asking in reply to the state’s current plea to stay and work. With too many retiring baby boomers and few millennials to take their place, treacherous seas may be ahead for a state that was once able to comfortably offer jobs to most of its population in an economy shaped by natural resources.

Maine desperately needs to restrain the departure of its college-aged population. Right now, the state has Opportunity Maine, an incentive program that reimburses Maine grads who continue to live and work here, but is that enough?

In a 2006 paper, University of Southern Maine professor Charles Colgan said that tourism “define[s] the Maine economy.” Eight years later, it continues to add revenue.

Out-of-staters can’t wait to visit Vacationland. But isn’t this a paradox? How are we luring in those who know little about Maine while allowing those educated for at least four years, and in some cases raised in Maine, to vanish after receiving a degree?

If you were to ask any of us 20-somethings why we are choosing to leave the state, we would likely say “there are more options” or “I want to see something different.” However, all of our responses would be followed up with “but I’d love to come back,” and, “it’s a great place to raise a family.”

We expect to come back to the beautiful Pine Tree State to raise children, coach high school teams and maybe take a crack at municipal government. But the age at which we are stepping away is the most crucial for population sustainability and the economic health of the state. If this age gap, combined with a decreasing population, continues to widen, we will be disappointed to find an unfamiliar state when, or if, we choose to return.

Career options are becoming narrower as our job

Trey Stewart is a second-year political science major, with a business and legal studies double minor, at the University of Maine. He originally hails from Presque Isle and is currently the author and editor of an online blog in Professor Robert Glover’s class on Maine government. This piece originally appeared in the Bangor Daily News on February 25, 2014.
creation rates drop — Maine was one of three states seeing negative growth in 2012-2013 — and, so far, a solution has yet to be found.

As one of five states without a city exceeding 100,000 in population, Maine lacks a central hub for booming business and thriving entertainment. Obviously, a city of that type would change Maine’s unique, rugged, “off-the-grid” character. But such changes may prove essential if we are to avoid dips in population rates that present monumental challenges for Maine’s future.

While many of the proposals to address demographics in Maine have involved the creation of “zones” to push businesses to relocate or expand, not enough has been done to incentivize younger individuals to stay in Maine (or relocate from elsewhere).

These young people are unlikely to be buying homes, at least not yet. Getting them to stay in Maine will mean subsidizing those who are providing quality, affordable housing for recent graduates. This could operate in the same way that we currently offer incentives or tax abatements as a means to stimulate job creation in Maine. And such incentives should be made conditional upon passing these incentives on to their tenants and residents in lower housing costs. These neighborhoods would serve as hubs for interaction with a distinctive, innovative atmosphere made up of fresh talent or rookie entrepreneurs.

We also have to confront the reality that most recent graduates are starting their lives under the burden of student debt, which might push them to seek higher wages outside of Maine. Sustaining and enhancing Opportunity Maine with a more robust incentive could be the Legislature’s first mode of action to attempt to address this.

However, this could be supplemented with programs (offered in coordination with colleges and universities) educating recent graduates about federal opportunities to reduce debt’s impact such as loan consolidation, income-based repayment, or public service loan forgiveness. If students are aware of these options, perhaps staying in Maine might seem like more of a reality.

With hard economic times continuing for the foreseeable future, it’s going to be difficult for the state to prove to us it’s worth staying here, but we have to figure something out. “I’d love to come back” needs to be transformed into “I’d love to make it here.”

Liam Nee is a fourth-year journalism and political science student at the University of Maine where he writes for The Maine Campus and hosts or co-hosts three radio shows on 91.9 FM WMEB. Nee writes about Maine’s demographic issues in a blog titled ‘Emigrationland.’ He was invited to contribute a guest OpEd for the Maine Chapter of the Scholars Strategy Network, which brings together scholars across the country to address public challenges and their policy implications. This piece originally appeared in the Bangor Daily News on April 2, 2014.

___________________________

Comments on the Turmoil in Ukraine
James W. Warhola, Ph.D.
Professor and Chairman, Political Science

As of this writing in late April the situation in Ukraine remains tense, uncertain, and fraught with dangers, both for the short-term escalation of violent conflict and for the longer-term pattern of relations in the region and also between Russia and the West more generally. The narrative produced and promulgated by both sides – Russia and the West – is strikingly different, with each side in effect (and sometimes explicitly and overtly) accusing the other side of exaggeration, manipulation, outright prevarication, and intrigue operating at various levels. Doubtless there are
elements of truth in each side’s narrative, and it will take some time for the events to work themselves out – and for historians to sort through the evidence to ascertain in detail what was causing what. We might begin that process now, with a look at the main themes in the narrative being provided by of the two major sides -- the West in general and US in particular, and Russia.

To the West in general and to the Obama administration in particular, Russia’s annexation of Crimea and subsequent actions in and around the Russian-Ukrainian border indicate an unacceptable departure from the norms of “the international community”, which departure calls for sanctions of various sorts and degrees. The picture is further complicated by a pattern of claimed distortion and prevarication undertaken by the Putin administration to present matters in a certain light that, from the perspective of the USA and the EU, does not comport with demonstrable facts. Various sanctions have already been imposed as of this writing, and they have already begun working their intended purpose of having a deleterious effect on the Russian economy.

To the Putin administration, the overthrow of popularly-elected President Viktor Yanukovich in late February, the events leading up to it, and the unfolding of events thereafter, were largely orchestrated by the Western powers, led by the United States, all with the intention of pulling Ukraine into the Western economic, political and military orbit. This is completely unacceptable to the Putin administration for two major reasons: first, since the mid-Middle Ages Ukraine has been tied to Russia by culture, history, and economy, and continues to be so until today – particularly regarding the intertwining of the Russian and Ukrainian economies in production of military equipment and in energy resources. The prospectively enlarged Eurasian Economic Union envisioned by president Putin to come into effect in 2015 called for a major role for Ukraine. This was the main (but not only) reason that the Putin administration exerted heavy influence on the Yanukovich government in November 2013 to not sign economic agreements with the EU, and instead to remain on track for membership in the gestating Eurasian Economic Union: currently, only Russia, Belarus, and Kazakhstan are members.

The second reason that Ukraine going into the Western economic, political, and possible military orbit was and is unacceptable to Moscow has more to do with Russian domestic political considerations, and these, in this writer’s view, were and remain probably more significant than even the first reason. Based on its experiences with significant levels of popular protest in autumn and winter 2011-2012, the Putin administration was keenly aware that the prospect of Maidan-like protests in Moscow itself were not out of the range of possibility. This, of course, was and remains completely unacceptable to the Russian national government; in their view, the Maidan Square revolt was on the one hand understandable given the corrupted, inept, and unstable regime in Kiev: president Putin declared as much in his post-Crimea referendum speech of 18 March. Yet on the other hand, the regime that has emerged in Kiev was illegitimate, derived from a coup d’etat, and thus had no warrant to claim legitimacy for its authority to govern, according to Mr. Putin. Moscow’s solution, then, is to advocate a “federalization” of Ukraine that grants broad autonomy to the various regions (particularly the southern and eastern regions in which high proportions of ethnic Russians reside), and keep significant military force on the Russian side of Ukrainian-Russian border just in case Ukraine degenerates into civil war. Professor Singleton’s commentary below deals with this matter in greater detail. Significantly, both the West and Russia each accuse the other side of engaging in intrigue, subterfuge, manipulation, and deliberate distortion of the “true facts” on the ground. Rebuilding the US-Russia bilateral relation will likely take some time and deliberate, determined action to restore much in the way of cooperation, mutual understanding, trust, and goodwill.

Despite the uncertainties of how the situation will play itself out, several key points are already clear;
acknowledging these will be essential for any possibility of moving beyond the current tensions and into an era of greater peace, stability, and prosperity – all of which are claimed goals, of all sides. First, the political calculus of Eurasia has changed; virtually all aspects of international relations – economic, political, and military – are now in transition. Second, it will take time, conscious effort, and a high level of determination, on each side, for US-Russian relations to be placed on a cooperative footing. And thirdly, no one wants civil war in Ukraine, yet as of this writing in late April, such appears increasingly possible.

“The View from Moscow: Why Russia Must Act……”
Seth Singleton, Ph.D.
Libra Professor of international Relations

Why Russia must act
Russia must absolutely prevent a nationwide Ukrainian election on May 25 and the seating of a clearly legitimate successor government. The demands of the Ukrainian revolutionaries are an end to corruption and a European future, via democratic change. The obvious question is, if Ukraine, why not Russia too? If the Maidan, why not Red Square? After all, Ukraine really is “little Russia”, joined for centuries. Putinism is threatened at its core.

Without Ukraine, Putin’s dream of a Great Power Russia, dominating a Eurasian Union able to compete with China and the US, is ridiculous. Russia will eventually have to choose between joining Europe or becoming an economic neocolony of China. Even with Ukraine, “Eurasia” is a far stretch. But Ukraine is the essential piece even to begin.

If the Ukraine adventure now fails, Putin will be personally discredited. His balloon will pop. Glorious Russian humor may quickly turn him into a joke. He’s not the sort of person to tolerate that. If the election is held, and the ensuing government is neither fascist nor incompetent, and independent, the virulent and mendacious anti-US and anti-Kiev propaganda campaign will collapse, even on Russian TV. If Ukraine then becomes more prosperous after a period of austerity, which is likely, Russians will notice.

Diplomacy has not achieved Russia’s goals. The effort to entice the West into a Great Power deal over the heads of the Ukrainians has failed. No one but Russia can save/deliver Ukraine.

Russia must act quickly
The “little green men” in facemasks who have taken over buildings and police stations in eastern Ukrainian cities are still in occupation, but the bands of thugs in the streets are increasingly unpopular. There has been no popular citizen uprising against Kiev and for Russia. The occupations are organized by a cadre of Russian GRU (military intelligence) operatives and special forces. “Little green men” are reportedly paid $300 or more a day. Occupiers and militia thugs, mostly unemployed young men, reportedly receive $30-50.

Massive propaganda from the thunderous and unanimous Russian TV machine continues – the Kiev government are “fascists” who are controlled by the US. The United States is singled out to drive a wedge between the US and Europe, particularly Germany. Various commentators exhort the Germans to be reasonable and avoid risk and tend to their economic interests. Many Germans listen. People have started disappearing in eastern Ukraine – tortured and dumped in a ditch (a city councilman), held incommunicado (the female mayor of Slovyansk), held by the occupiers (American Russian-born journalist Ostrovsky, whose VICE News videos tell more than thousands of words what is happening in eastern Ukraine). The reason people are disappearing is that the story of popular uprising and no Russian invasion is crumbling; the locals and the journalists know and will tell the truth. The disappearances and arrests are desperation; the lies can’t be maintained much longer.
“Putler,” the image of Putin as Hitler, continues to stand in Maidan Square in Kiev and is passed around the Internet. Intolerable.

In Kiev, one source says captured Russian intelligence officers are under interrogation and apparently have been talking. Their stories could be publicized.

The wished-for split between the US and Germany/Europe hasn’t happened either, or at least not yet. The Europeans remain cautious and in some cases indifferent, but show no signs of breaking with Washington or of embracing the Russian line.

As one scholar put it, Angela Merkel has a few weeks to decide the fate of Europe. Sanctions will be increased. Already the US has barred one Russian bank, and may move on to Sberbank, Russia’s biggest. If the British cooperate, which they may not, billions in assets of Russia’s oligarchs, or of some of them, could be frozen in London. The Russian economy is in a downward spiral, with large scale capital flight, declining ruble, and little prospect of foreign investment. Negative growth is expected. Crimea will cost perhaps $15 billion.

Putin is riding a bicycle and he has to go faster. With recession beginning, he can’t allow Russia’s hyper-nationalist fervor to cool. Above all, he can’t be seen to have “lost Ukraine,” after he has put all his bets on a powerful, confident, expanding Russia protecting its civilization from the evil Americans. Invasion, by whatever means, will be justified as “protecting Russians” or “Russian citizens” (in that case, the invaders will have to pass out the passports as they go). Note that this was exactly Hitler’s line when Germany invaded Poland on September 1, 1939. Commentaries in Russia now separate the acceptable Hitler, who gathered up all the German-speakers in Czechoslovakia and Austria, from the bad Hitler who later invaded non-German countries.

Hence Foreign Minister Lavrov’s statement of April 23 that Ukraine can be compared to South Ossetia and Russia may intervene anywhere to protect its citizens abroad.

Kiev provides the pretext
Reports on 24 April say Ukrainian forces are trying to recover occupied buildings, with casualties. This mimics the 2008 Georgian attack on Tskhinvali, in South Ossetia, which was the pretext for Russian invasion.

Russian aims
Russia has from the beginning made three demands. “Federalizatsiya” meaning balkanization of Ukraine, with regions free to secede or join Russia. No association, none, with either NATO or the EU. Removal of “fascists”, meaning all leaders unacceptable to Russia, from the government in Kiev. If Ukraine is “federalized”, each bit could welcome Russian “peacekeepers,” as in Abkhazia or South Ossetia. Reluctant regions might even be persuaded to do so. The “federalized” bits could then, if Russia so decided, regroup as “Novorossiya,” the Ukrainian east and south, adding now contiguous Transnistria (in Moldova). Russia would then treat “Novorossiya” as a protectorate or neocolony – but not pay its pensions or fix its roads.

In an invasion, Russia would most likely go as far as Kiev, leaving a rump Western Ukraine. Or maybe go even farther. Then Russia would become utterly reasonable – we will pull the Russian Army out of Western Ukraine if you agree to, and sign on to, our demands (see above). We expect any remaining Ukrainian government to sign, and we expect the EU and the US to sign too, as guarantors – acceptance of a peace treaty ending the war (although it wouldn’t be called that) with a complete Russian victory. For giving us Ukraine, and respectability too, we will allow peace. And if anyone in what is left in Ukraine makes trouble for us, or tries to join Europe, we know what to do. Of course, that’s not how diplomats say these things. If Putin follows Aleksandr Dugin’s scenario, the next stage of the war for Eurasia, sometime later,
will be to split Germany from the United States and attach it to Russia. Dugin and his Eurasia geopolitics is another posting.

Does Putin believe that he is saving Russian civilization from Evil? Perhaps. By now, he may be in an echo chamber of his own propaganda. Can he be dissuaded? We will see.
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