

# The UN Says the Ukrainian People Must Decide their Fate, NATO Wants Something Else

By [Carla Stea](#)

Global Research, December 29, 2013

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

Theme: [Global Economy](#), [US NATO War](#)  
[Agenda](#)

In-depth Report: [UKRAINE REPORT](#)

*On December 8, 2013, United Nations Secretary General Ban-Ki moon telephoned Ukrainian President Yanukovich to discuss the deteriorating and destabilizing situation in Kiev, as Ukrainian demonstrators, in an action some described as vandalism, smashed and beheaded a public statue, a symbolic action foreboding violent civil conflict, ostensibly protesting Yanukovich's government's refusal to sign, according to the New York Times, "sweeping political and free-trade agreements with the European Union."*

The NYT's statement was a gross misrepresentation of the reality of the agreement which the US and NATO countries were virtually coercing Ukraine to sign. But to its credit, on December 12, the NYT acknowledged,

"For months, the International Monetary Fund has refused to sign off on a nearly \$15 billion dollar bailout loan that Ukraine needs by March to refinance its external debt. The IMF wants Ukraine to accept harsh conditions including raising domestic gas prices, and imposing strict budgetary austerity. These conditions could also lead to more political upheaval."

A US State Department official and former US Ambassador to NATO was reported to have attempted to bully the Ukrainian government into signing the EU agreement which would have dragged Ukraine into the economic crisis plaguing Western European countries, and transformed Ukraine into a puppet state, completing NATO's military encirclement of Russia.

"I made it absolutely clear to him [*President Yanukovich*] that what happened last night, what has been happening in security terms here, is absolutely impermissible in a European state, in a democratic state. We also made clear that we believe there is a way out for Ukraine, that it is still possible to save Ukraine's European future,"

The European accords were expected to be accompanied by a rescue package from the IMF, but Mr. Yanukovich had already rejected that because of the conditions attached."

The former US ambassador to NATO had apparently also lectured the infinitely more sophisticated Russian President Putin, "urging Russia to use its influence to press for peace, human dignity and a political solution, and emphasized Ukraine's need for 'a return to economic health with the support of the International Monetary Fund.'"

The Association Agreement is a Doorway to NATO Expansion

But this is the “prettier” side of the US and EU seduction which will culminate in merely ravaging the Ukrainian economy and society. In reality, the Ukraine-EU Association Agreement is part of a military arrangement which will enable NATO to completely split Ukraine from Russia, and place it in the perilous position of being in the middle of any east-west confrontation. Eastern Ukrainians are fiercely opposed to Ukraine’s signing this inherently military document of incorporation into the EU, and the West’s provocative encouragement of Kiev’s demonstrations against Yanukovich risked inciting a civil war.

The proposed “Association Agreement” between the Ukraine and the European Union is in fact a dangerous NATO military agreement disguised as a customs and economic agreement. Even if the treaty does not pass, it reveals the truly continuing aggressive goals of the NATO leadership and their willingness to use all means of deceit to achieve their ends. Clearly in order for the military elements of this proposal to have reached this stage of development, Ukraine-NATO military discussions and commitments must already be intensive and advanced. This explains the extraordinary anger on the part of the NATO countries when Ukraine withdrew from this agenda.

The treaty was surrounded by a propaganda campaign which fraudulently tried to convince the Ukrainian people and the world that it was an economic agreement bringing prosperity and no visa requirements for travel within the EU. The military component of this ‘economic agreement’ is actually the first substantive part of the document (see Title II Articles 4-16).

NATO’s plan under the Agreement is accomplished by integrating Ukraine into the EU’s military structure (the European Common Security and Defense Policy-ESDP or CSDP – which is dominated by powerful NATO states, and the text makes it clear that association with the EU military structure includes its coordination with the US military and NATO).

The goal is to incorporate Ukraine into NATO’s continuing drive east against Russia and Belarus, the targeted regions to the east and south of the Black Sea, and even “global” challenges (see Article 4, Sec.2(c)).

The Treaty calls for a “political dialogue” to promote “convergence on foreign and security matters with the aim of Ukraine’s ever deeper involvement into the European security area (and) strengthen cooperation and dialogue between the Parties on international security and crisis management, notably in order to address global (!) and regional challenges and key threats” (Article 4, Sec. 1, Sec. 2(c)).

This political military dialogue is coordinated at various levels in several structures:

- The EU’s Political and Security Committee (which coordinates both (1) the EU Military Committee, where the Defense Ministers coordinate operations, as well as (2) the Political Military Group) (Article 5 Sec. 3 (a))
- “all diplomatic and military channels between the Parties, including appropriate contacts in third countries (United States) and within the United Nations, the OSCE, and other international fora (ie, NATO)” (Article 5 Sec. 3 (b). “Cooperation...shall aim at increasing policy convergence and effectiveness, and promoting joint policy planning. To this end, the Parties shall make use of bilateral (ie, including US-Ukrainian), international (ie NATO) and regional fora” (Article 7, Sec. 1)

- And “regular meetings both at the level of high officials and of experts of the military institutions of the Parties,” (Article 5, Sec. 3(c));
- And the European Defense Agency (Article 10 Sec. 3) which reports to the European Commission.

The Treaty calls for “increased participation of Ukraine in EU-led “civilian and military crisis management operations as well as relevant exercises and training” (Article 10, Sec. 1). Article 10, Section 3 specifically mandates the kind of military technological cooperation necessary for the degree of interoperability critical for unified command and control and combat efficiency; anticipating that Ukraine would sign onto this agreement, on June 24, 2013 the EU-Ukraine Cooperation Council which was established to implement the agreement published the “EU-Ukraine Association Agenda to prepare and facilitate the implementation of the Association Agreement” including: “increase interoperability where appropriate between Ukrainian peacekeeping units and EU Member States forces through lessons learned from relevant EU crisis management operations to which Ukraine participated, and through involvement of the units of the Armed Forces of Ukraine into the formation of EU Multinational Tactical Battle groups.” The issue has been framed between the 2008 Bucharest summit where NATO declared that Ukraine will become a member of NATO whenever it wants and when it meets the criteria for accession and June 3, 2010 when the Ukrainian parliament rejected, with 226 votes, the goal of “integration into Euro-Atlantic security and NATO membership” from the country’s national security strategy. The European Union and US are inciting a Revolt in Ukraine to Expand NATO. The US and NATO “support” – in reality, incitement – of the protesters in Kiev who violently smashed and decapitated the statue of Lenin bears an alarming similarity to the US NATO approach to civil disorder in Syria. One can only wonder how many of the “demonstrators” in Kiev were spontaneously and authentically opposed to Yanukovich’s government. Certainly, IMF imposed austerity measures have nothing to do with the “dignity” and democratic rights of Ukrainian citizens, who would be degraded by the imposition of IMF austerity measures which would further demolish their sparse living conditions. Of course, the separation of Ukraine from Russia was a paramount goal of *The Grand Chessboard*. It is also imperative to question the motives of US-NATO support for the Ukrainian Svoboda party, whose Nazi sympathies and affiliation are notorious – and well documented.

This attempt to incorporate Ukraine into NATO garishly highlights the violation of the promise given by James Baker to Gorbachev, that “NATO will not expand one inch east of Berlin.”

The United Nations daily press briefing of 13 December, 2013 affirmed:

“It’s for the people of Ukraine to decide their own future. Everybody’s watching very closely what is happening on the streets and through dialogue, which is the most important aspect of all this; it remains to be seen what the outcome will be. But it is for the people of Ukraine to decide and, of course, many countries are concerned about the tensions there are. The Secretary-General has expressed his own concerns about those tensions and has spoken to President Viktor Yanukovich about the need for dialogue and the need for restraint on all sides. But, ultimately, it’s for the people of Ukraine to decide.”

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Carla Stea](#)

#### About the author:

Author and Geopolitical analyst Carla Stea is Global Research's Correspondent at United Nations headquarters, New York, NY.

**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)