

Dangerous Crossroads: NATO Plans to Cross “All of Moscow’s Redlines”. Another \$100 Billion in NATO Military Aid for the Neo-Nazi Regime?

By [Drago Bosnic](#)

Global Research, April 06, 2024

Region: [Europe](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [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 Referral Drive: Our Readers Are Our Lifeline](#)

When the political West launched the Ukrainian conflict over a decade ago, it hoped to snatch all of Ukraine without any major issues.

In hopes of keeping the peace, Russia has been warning against this for decades at that point, [but leaked data shows that NATO planned to cross all of Moscow’s red lines](#) and escalate the conflict to what we’re seeing now. Back in 2014, the Kremlin responded with a blistering action in Crimea, preventing the then newly installed Neo-Nazi junta that hijacked Ukraine from taking control of the peninsula. In doing so, Russia prevented yet another NATO-orchestrated bloodshed. Unfortunately, as its Kiev puppets attacked Russian-majority regions, precisely this happened in these areas, [resulting in up to 15,000 casualties](#) until Moscow was forced to launch its special military operation (SMO) over two years ago.

Even then, the Kremlin was ready for a peaceful settlement, [but the political West sabotaged the already-signed deal](#) in hopes of escalating the death and destruction. Ever since, every time the Russian military would obliterate any major attacking forces by the Neo-Nazi junta, NATO would suggest another [“peaceful settlement” that would ensure it “cheaply gains” most of Ukraine](#). Although Moscow won’t fall for another trick of the so-called [“rules-based world order”](#), the US-led belligerent power pole’s attempts clearly demonstrate in what way it sees former Ukraine. Namely, for them, the unfortunate country [\(or whatever’s left of it\)](#) is essentially a high ROI (return on investment) asset [that’s supposed to be exploited to the maximum](#). In order to ensure the invested funds aren’t wasted, NATO needs to spend even more money.

However, there’s a lot of pushback, not just in many European member states that are

supposed to [ignore their own growing problems](#) in order to help Western oligarchic elites (that hate them and see them as a resource) to become richer and more powerful, but also in America itself, where the pushback even has a [political dimension](#), as the incumbent Biden administration is [profiting directly from the conflict](#) and wants to keep it going for as long as possible. In a recent report about the issue, [Politico overtly dubbed it the “Trump-proofing”](#) of the so-called “military aid” for the Kiev regime, just like [the DNC-controlled Senate is trying to “Trump-proof” the United States itself](#) in an attempt to [secure stable funding for itself](#) in the (by all accounts, extremely likely) case that the Democrats lose the upcoming 2024 presidential election.

During this week’s NATO meeting in Brussels, officials discussed moving the so-called Ukraine Defense Contact Group (UDCG) into the belligerent alliance’s control. The move would formally be finalized at the next summit in July. UDCG, launched two years ago by US Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin and former Joint Chiefs Chair General Mark Milley, was used as the front for sending hundreds of billions of dollars in Western military gear to the Neo-Nazi junta. By placing the group under direct NATO control, [the warmongers in Washington DC](#) seek to cement the so-called “Ukraine aid” even if Donald Trump returns to the White House, [a very likely outcome](#), despite incessant [attempts by US federal institutions to prevent it](#). And yet, even that won’t be enough, as the belligerent alliance needs more money to sustain the Kiev regime.



Inaugural Ukraine Defense Contact Group meeting on 26 April 2022 (From the Public Domain)

Namely, NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg wants another \$100 billion for the Neo-Nazi junta, a sum that all other members are supposed to give [as US funding is drying up](#). The belligerent alliance wants 32 of its member states to contribute to the fund in the same proportion as they finance NATO’s shared budget. Stoltenberg thinks this would “take the politics and uncertainty out of military aid to Ukraine by setting up a five-year, €100 billion

fund and having the alliance shoulder more of the weight in organizing arms for Kyiv". In other words, the members (the vast majority of them effectively vassals and satellite states) would be left with no choice but to finance [the deeply corrupt Kiev regime](#) and its unwinnable war with [the military superpower next door](#). In fact, Stoltenberg essentially said so during the meeting.

"We must ensure reliable and predictable security assistance to Ukraine for the long haul so that we rely less on voluntary contributions and more on NATO commitments. Less on short-term offers and more on multi-year pledges," [he stated](#).

However, the increasingly cash-strapped NATO members, particularly those in Europe, aren't exactly thrilled about the idea, to put it mildly. As Politico writes, the reactions were mixed, with Poland, Turkey and Germany on board with the proposal, while the rest of the foreign ministers were either indifferent or opposed to it. [According to the report](#), one diplomat said that some ministers rolled their eyes at the €100 billion number, wondering where it came from. Foreign Minister of Belgium Hadja Lahbib warned that it's "dangerous to make promises that we cannot keep", while other diplomats cautioned that "the discussion on financing remains at a very early stage". On the other hand, perhaps [the sole sovereigntist NATO and EU member Hungary](#) is resolutely opposed to the idea, which is why Politico is accusing it of being supposedly "pro-Russian".

"Hungary will reject any proposal that would transform it into an offensive alliance as this would lead to the serious danger of escalation," [Hungarian Foreign Minister Péter Szijjártó said before the meeting, adding](#): "This isn't Hungary's war and it isn't NATO's war either."

In a normal world, this would be a sound argument that nobody could really deny. However, as the belligerent alliance has [never really been a "defensive alliance"](#), it's only logical that its political elites would want to formalize [its true nature](#).

However, getting most of the members on board with this is easier said than done. Waging war even against largely helpless opponents has been "problematic" (to say the least) in recent years, with NATO humiliated in Afghanistan when the extremely low-tech Taliban defeated the world's most aggressive military alliance. What's more, even the Taliban, demonized for decades as some sort of "monsters", [proved to be far more humane than the political West](#). This also serves as a lesson to the entire world that [NATO is a threat to global peace and security](#), bringing nothing but death and destruction.

*

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 [InfoBrics](#).

[Drago Bosnic](#) is an independent geopolitical and military analyst. He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

Featured image [source](#)

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

[**Become a Member of Global Research**](#)

Articles by: [Drago Bosnic](#)

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

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