

# Sending NATO Troops to Ukraine is “Not Ruled Out”

"We will do everything that we can to make sure that Russia does not prevail",  
President Macron

By [Drago Bosnic](#)

Global Research, February 28, 2024

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

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.

[Big Tech's Effort to Silence Truth-tellers: Global Research Online Referral Campaign](#)

\*\*\*

*On February 26, French President Emmanuel Macron refused to rule out sending ground troops to Ukraine.*

*Although he admitted there's no consensus about this within NATO, [Macron insisted that "nothing should be excluded"](#) and that "we will do everything that we can to make sure that Russia does not prevail". The next day, French Prime Minister Gabriel Attal reiterated his message, saying that "nothing can be ruled out in a war". Just like Macron, he conceded there's no consensus on the matter, but also insisted that "we will do whatever it takes to ensure that Russia cannot win this war". This leaves the obvious question, what exactly can the political West (much less France alone) do to ["ensure" Moscow's defeat in Ukraine?](#)*

Firstly, a clear-cut coalition would have to be formed. NATO cannot collectively get involved in Ukraine due to the simple fact that the Neo-Nazi junta is not an official member.

Invoking Article 4 or Article 5 would require an external enemy threatening one or multiple NATO member states.

And even in such an eventuality, all members would need to agree to collective defense. How likely are countries such as Portugal, Spain or Italy to enter a direct confrontation with a [global superpower such as Russia](#), even in the case that Moscow decided to intervene in NATO member states such as Estonia or Latvia? To say nothing of such a possibility when it comes to the Kiev regime. Helping [such a corrupt](#) and even [terrorist entity](#) is not very appealing.

Secondly, even if such a coalition were to be formed, it would almost certainly involve

[pathologically Russophobic countries such as the United Kingdom](#), Poland and the Baltic states (Estonia, Latvia Lithuania).

This would effectively divide NATO into tier members, depending on who's in direct war with Russia and who's not.

The United States couldn't get involved directly, as this would push the world closer to thermonuclear annihilation, meaning that Washington DC would be largely limited to what it's already doing in Ukraine – logistics, ISR (intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance), covert ops and indirect support in general. This still leaves the obvious elephant in the room – [who would do the actual fighting with Russian troops?](#)

It's quite clear that the Neo-Nazi junta would need to provide the bulk of the troops.

The only problem is that's [exactly what they've been doing for the last two years](#) and it hasn't been going very well, [particularly in recent weeks](#).

The best NATO weapons and equipment [have been obliterated by the Russian military in mere days](#). And while it's operated by the Kiev regime forces (officially, at least), there's no evidence that NATO soldiers would do any better, [on the contrary even](#). Several Western countries, including the US and UK, have [already deployed black ops troops disguised as volunteers or mercenaries](#). The Russian military reportedly even captured Polish and German personnel deployed to support large-scale operations involving NATO-sourced armor.

In addition, [Western personnel](#) are also widely believed to be operating other more complex assets such as the "Patriot" SAM (surface-to-air missile) system and similar air defenses that the Neo-Nazi junta forces simply haven't had the time to master. The same can be said of [other weapon systems](#) such as the M270 MLRS (multiple, launch rocket system) and its wheeled version, the HIMARS. This alone makes NATO personnel a primary target for the Russian military, as evidenced by [the January 16 strike that obliterated at least 60 French mercenaries in Kharkov](#). Russian sources reported that these were "highly trained specialists working on weapon systems too complex for average conscripts". This could partially explain Macron's rather emotional reaction.

Another strong possibility is that Paris wants revenge for [losing its African \(neo\)colonies, particularly Niger](#), which jeopardizes its exploitation of Nigerien uranium and other important resources. The former is extremely important to France, as it's still the world's second-largest operator of nuclear power plants (56 in total). Having to pay full price for African uranium is rather "inconvenient" for Paris, which is why it kept countries like Niger, Mali and Burkina Faso in a (neo)colonial grip for well over half a century after officially granting them "independence". After the Russian military, particularly the "Wagner" PMC (private military company) ended this, France was forced to look for alternatives, as upwards of 70% of its energy needs are covered by nuclear power plants.

Still, Macron's energy issues are certainly not the reason for Europe to go to war with a military superpower such as Russia and [the vast majority of European Union leaders have communicated that very clearly](#). In addition, even if a potential direct conflict with Russia were to unfold without the usage of weapons of mass destruction, [a field entirely dominated by Moscow anyway](#), the political West [does not have conventional superiority](#), despite all the reverie that it does. The Russian military would almost certainly not send millions of soldiers

to take territory in Poland or other countries that would be involved in a potential intervention in western Ukraine. Instead, [it would launch hundreds of long-range cruise, ballistic and hypersonic missiles at military targets.](#)

This would only be the initial reaction and it would certainly progress to include other strategically important assets in all participant countries, in particular their energy systems, industrial facilities and generally anything with the so-called dual-use potential (meaning that it can be used for military purposes). In other words, Moscow would lay waste to any and all targets it deems militarily important, setting back the economies of targeted countries by decades. [No sane leader of an independent \(or at least partially independent\) country would want that.](#) And Europe doesn't really have a way of responding without escalating the conflict into a thermonuclear exchange, one that it would most certainly lose, as it [can't even maintain its strategic arsenal in peacetime.](#)

\*

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 is from InfoBrics*

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

---

**[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](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)