

NATO Summit Closes By Condemning Russia. US Soldiers and Weapons to Russia's Border

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, July 09, 2016

Region: [Europe](#)

Theme: [Military and WMD, US NATO War Agenda](#)

The issues that were discussed at this year's NATO Summit were mainly preparations for a possible war against Russia.

The two-day Summit in Warsaw Poland ended on Saturday July 9th, with a 139-part ["Warsaw Summit Communiqué"](#) which used the word "terrorism" 17 times, "jihad" and "jihadist" and "jihadism" 0 (zero) times, and "Russia" 58 times — never favorably, and often with overt hostility.

It also referred to "Ukraine" 34 times, and "Syria" 10 times. Ukraine, during [a February 2014 coup](#) (it has been referred to as having been a "coup" both by [the leader of the private CIA firm Stratfor](#), and by [the Establishment writer on international relations John Mearsheimer](#), among others) switched, immediately after the coup, from having been [neutral between NATO and Russia](#), to being [suddenly and consistently intensely hostile to Russia](#), and immediately applied to join NATO; Syria still remains strongly allied with Russia.



The Ukrainian government was referred to 100% favorably, and the Syrian government was referred to 100% unfavorably.

In other words: the Communiqué is 100% hostile toward Russia and its ally Syria, and is far more concerned about Russia than it is about terrorism — and not at all concerned about jihadism and jihadists.

The Communiqué is clear about "the crisis in and around Ukraine being, in current circumstances, the first topic on our agenda." All of its references to that matter are based upon the assumption that this problem is due entirely to Russian "aggression" and that all violations of the Minsk agreements on the Ukrainian conflict are by the pro-Russian separatists, none of the violations are on the Ukrainian government side.

The presumption is that the Ukrainian government side never commits aggression, and that the separatist side is never defending itself against Ukrainian aggression. The Communiqué says, regarding the Special Monitoring Mission that is overseeing implementation of the Minsk agreements:

Impediments to the SMM's work, which continue to occur overwhelmingly in areas under the control of the Russian-backed militants, represent a violation of the Minsk Agreements and seriously hamper the monitoring function of the SMM."

The SMM operates in, and issues [daily reports](#) from, the separatist region (Donbass, consisting of two parts: Luhansk and Donetsk), and therefore it's natural that almost all of those reports concern that region, not Ukraine. However, for example, [the report dated 7 July 2016](#) does note that,

“Civilians expressed their anger at continued shelling while other civilians expressed their frustration over water cuts. The SMM facilitated and monitored adherence to the ceasefire to enable repairs to essential infrastructure.”

Though this report was, indeed, as NATO phrases the matter, “in areas under the control of the Russian-backed militants” (i.e., of people who live in the region that rejects the coup-imposed Ukrainian government), the “violation of the Minsk agreements” there consisted actually of shelling that was fired from the Ukrainian government forces, into “areas under the control of the Russian-backed militants.”

Similarly, the Communiqué blames the war in Syria upon the Russian-allied side, which in that case happens to be the Syrian government. For example, it says:

“We call on the Syrian regime to fully comply with the provisions of all relevant United Nations Security Council Resolutions (UNSCRs), and to immediately take steps for a genuine political transition in accordance with UNSCR 2254 and the 30 June 2012 Geneva Communiqué.”

That conflict is between jihadists who are trying to overthrow the Syrian government, and the Syrian government. NATO blames the conflict entirely upon the Syrian government.

The Communiqué describes at some length the sharp increase in soldiers and weapons that NATO is pouring onto and near Russia's borders, especially in Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Romania. The reason that's given for this surrounding Russia with hostile forces is:

...the ongoing illegal and illegitimate annexation of Crimea, which we do not and will not recognise and which we call on Russia to reverse; the violation of sovereign borders by force; the deliberate destabilisation of eastern Ukraine;

large-scale snap exercises contrary to the spirit of the Vienna Document, and provocative military activities near NATO borders, including in the Baltic and Black Sea regions and the Eastern Mediterranean; its irresponsible and aggressive nuclear rhetoric, military concept and underlying posture;

and its repeated violations of NATO Allied airspace. In addition, Russia's military intervention, significant military presence and support for the regime in Syria, and its use of its military presence in the Black Sea to project power into the Eastern Mediterranean have posed further risks and challenges for the security of Allies and others.

No mention is made in the Communiqué of the event that sparked all of this, which was Washington's Ukrainian coup, which [Washington had been preparing starting no later than 1 March 2013 in its Ukrainian Embassy](#) to overthrow the democratically elected President of Ukraine, Viktor Yanukovich.

When NATO demands, regarding Crimea’s return to Russia shortly after the coup, “we do not and will not recognise and ... we call on Russia to reverse”; when NATO demands Russia to abandon the 90+% of Crimeans who wanted to rejoin as being part of Russia — when NATO demands Russia to consign these people to the now failed state of Ukraine ([which hates them and wants them dead](#)) — NATO is placing itself in the position of a continuing escalation toward nuclear war against Russia, unless NATO itself disbands or else cancels its demand. NATO is now in a position where they will either cancel their demand, or else continue their escalation and surrounding-of-Russia to the point where Russia will have no alternative but to unleash (without warning) all-out nuclear war against NATO countries, and against all nations, such as Ukraine, that hate Russians so much that they are trying to join NATO — the anti-Russia club of nations.

Russia is not going to do what NATO demands. The question now is: which side will start the nuclear war — attack first. In any case, the war (assuming that NATO neither retracts its demand nor disbands, and so war results) will probably be over within less than an hour. There won’t be any winners, but the side that strikes first will be destroyed less than will the side that merely retaliates. And, in *that* sense, there will be a ‘winner’, even to an all-out nuclear war. Regardless, though, Vladimir Putin’s responsibility is only to the Russian people, no matter how unacceptable the two choices are that NATO has offered him. He has tried many times to discuss the matter with Barack Obama, who [always refuses to discuss it with him](#). Obama’s refusal speaks clearer than any mere words, either from him or from (his agent) [NATO’s Supreme Allied Commander](#), possibly could.

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of [They’re Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010](#), and of [CHRIST’S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity](#).

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Eric Zuesse](#), Global Research, 2016

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Eric Zuesse](#)

About the author:

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of [They’re Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010](#), and of [CHRIST’S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity](#).

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