

New York Times: USA Running All Operational Decisions in Ukraine

The New York Times article that just came out over the weekend is the second one in a year that admits the deep and scrupulous ways in which the USA has been directly fighting this war against Russia. Not through a semi-independent proxy, but by way of directly organising and coordinating attacks with the Ukrainians little more than front-line executioners of Washington's "Kill Chain"—as they themselves apparently called it. And the worst things of all: The Americans even blame Ukraine for not sacrificing enough men and resisting sending more young men to die at the front lines. Absolute depravity.

#M2

Hello, everybody. So we really need to talk about this New York Times article that came out over the weekend. I'm talking about this one here, which depicts the incredible and hidden secret history of the West's war with Russia fought in Ukraine. I'm calling this incredible because for anyone watching this channel or other channels that have been talking about this proxy war for the last three years, you will know that, of course, the United States was a main belligerent in the entire affair. But for the longest time, for three years, we've been told that the US and the Europeans are not part of the war, right? That they're supporting Ukraine, that they're just helping, that they're just delivering weapons.

And over the last year, the West actually started slowly changing that narrative. This article here is as deep and as disturbing as it gets in the way the New York Times, the so-called paper of record, presents it. Keep in mind, if it's in the New York Times, it is, to the American mind, engraved in world history. The way this world history is now written, or the tone in which it is written by the journalist—or propagandist, if you can call him that—Adam Entous, is quite incredible. The level of admissions we are now getting about how this war has been conducted by the United States is fascinating.

And this is not the first such article that we are getting. There was another one almost exactly a year ago by the same guy, Adam Entous. I'm sorry, I don't know how to pronounce his name, the same journalist who wrote this piece here about the spy war, how the CIA secretly helps Ukraine fight Putin. So last year, he published this piece in which he already came out with a lot of information that we've been talking about on this channel before, discussing how deep the roots of US integration and militarization of Ukraine go. But that was, for at least two or three years at that point, still considered a conspiracy theory, right?

And then the New York Times comes out with admissions that already in 2016, the CIA began training an elite Ukrainian commando force and that the CIA also helped train a new generation of Ukrainian spies who operated inside Russia, and so on and so forth. All of these admissions show how deep the CIA's network inside Ukraine goes, how long the precursor was to the start of the special military operation in 2022, and how the West really did militarize Ukraine. The United States did prepare Ukraine for fighting against Russia, and what the goal of all of that was. And now we get, by the same person, a second article, and this is not just an article; this is half a book. It's a huge, huge article that is very long and very extensive, but it's clearly a narrative. It's built up as a narrative.

It's built up as a hagiography, the history of the saints who fought this war, who thought about it, and who were methodically working on winning it. This kind of victory narrative about the good Americans and the brave Ukrainians includes certain mistakes and mishaps on the way to the success of warfare, which, of course, then ends in non-success. Toward the end, the article culminates in the point that, oh, now Donald Trump threw it all out, and the Ukrainians, in fact, screwed it up. That's the main argument of the article: the Biden administration did whatever they could, the U.S. general staff, the U.S. military was doing splendidly and was giving the best of good advice, but there were screw-ups on the Ukrainian side, who didn't implement the strategy well enough. Then the political change in the United States basically changes everything. But, you know, let's start with the beginning. Let's start with the fact that the article establishes very clearly Ukraine was never alone.

It was never just supported with weapons. The whole war was directly guided by the Americans and directly operational. Operations were done by the Americans. It even quotes people who said, apparently, that the U.S. is now an integral part of the kill chain. So without the U.S., without U.S. intelligence, without U.S. coordinates and back-office support, the Ukrainians wouldn't be able to kill Russians, right? And then the article actually celebrates, more or less, the dying of Russians and the successful killing of Russians. It's a really, really disgusting article on many different levels. And I will show you a couple of the most disgusting things now. The big admission here is that what happened in Kiev didn't just happen in Kiev. Everything was basically planned from the American side.

The command or the operational headquarters was in Wiesbaden, Germany, and the Ukrainian generals regularly went to Wiesbaden. The connection between Wiesbaden and Kiev was direct, and these people really went to Wiesbaden to Germany to get direct orders from the United States on what to do. Of course, the article frames it in a way that always makes sure the Ukrainians look as if they asked for it, as if this was the Americans extending a helping hand unwillingly. They didn't really want to, but in the end, they stepped up and took over the responsibility they had as that shining city on the hill and actually helped the underdog, right? Helping the underdog to win a war. That's the narrative here. I cannot show you the entire article. A, it's much too long. B, it's behind a paywall, but I did make a couple of screenshots just to discuss this with you.

You know, the article speaks about, in the beginning, that on a tactical level, the partnership yielded triumph upon triumph. Yet, at arguably the pivotal moment of the war in mid-2023, the strategy devised in Wiesbaden fell victim to the factious internal politics of Ukraine. So, this is really, you know, at the outset of the article, it describes itself. This is the story that this propagandist creates, that, you know, this was all going well. This was so brilliant. And, of course, they use the early victories of the Ukrainians in 2022 right after the Russians changed their strategy and went from trying to scare the Ukrainians into making a deal into a long war of attrition, which is, by the way, something the article never discusses. The article never ever says that from the Russian side this, after April-May 2022, morphed from...

#M2

Scare tactics into an attrition war, it never mentions that. It keeps pretending that all the Russians care about is territory. And whenever the Ukrainians win territory, it's a great victory for the Ukrainians. And whenever the Russians advance a little bit, it just shows that they're not able to advance more. At no point does this article ever discuss the pivotal aspect that for the Russians, ever after summer 2022, it became clear that this war would be about destroying NATO infrastructure and destroying all of the Ukrainian forces and just dealing with and destroying everything that NATO could throw at Russia inside Ukraine.

The article never goes there. And you can see how disingenuous this entire narrative is. But it gets very, very bad in the way that this so-called investigation tries to depict the utter dependence of the Ukrainians and how the Ukrainians were really just the executioners of orders that came from Washington, how it tries to shape that into something more understandable to the Western mind, right, as a partnership instead of a clear and utter vertical integration in which the Ukrainians were ordered to go and die for the tactical dreams of the Anglo-Americans.

It's really, really surprising. And, you know, in other programs, like on the Duran and also other commentators, they discuss whether this is a proxy war or not. I think Alexander Mercouris made the point that this is a coalition war, actually, and that this article is also an admission that it is a coalition war. I'm not sure. I don't think we have a proper word for what this war actually is now that we have all of these admissions on the table by the side who was fighting it and who was conceiving of it primarily.

Because in a proxy war, usually you have the great powers who then have proxy forces who fight each other instead of the great powers. But here we have Russia that is actively fighting inside another state and is fighting the combined forces and the combined potential of a hostile military coalition. So this was a Russia-NATO war or is a Russia-NATO war in all but name. This is NATO actually trying to take on the biggest of its supposed enemies without ever admitting to it and by constantly pretending that this is not what is actually happening in order to prevent Russia from going all out, which they actually did.

They actually confined the fighting, NATO-Russia fighting, to the territory of Ukraine, but they did so in very, very brutal ways. The article actually says a New York Times investigation reveals that America was woven into the war more intimately and broadly than previously understood. Again, any observer of this war understood this. If you didn't go for the media narrative and media spin in the West, but actually looked at proper military analysis and followed the political activities, you would see how the Ukrainians were able to fight only with the intelligence and support of the Americans and also the Brits and French to some extent.

And so the fact that we didn't have official British, French, and American troops on the ground is really only just one layer of the war fighting that was going on. It was decided by the Americans that this war would be fought with Ukrainians, to the last Ukrainian, actually, as we will see as well. Here we have the article giving us these pictures to paint this heroic image of the Americans with the Ukrainians looking at maps and making joint decisions, right? When, in fact, the article leaves no question about who was in charge of everything, right? We have this passage here, and they're talking, of course, of the red lines, of the...

#M2

The Russians, because these people, and the article here admits to, were aware that the Russians might go nuclear at any point in time, right? And that this might become an all-out nuclear Third World War, and that these people were willing to take that risk. This is the level of madness that these militarist psychopaths actually went into instead of negotiating an end to the war, instead of in April 2022 having a compromise, having a neutrality agreement for Ukraine, having the Istanbul agreements signed. Instead of that, they wanted to go all the way to the Third World War if necessary. And post facto, this propagandist now tries to make you believe that this was carefully crafted.

You know, everything was well calculated, and it was always ensured that nothing would escalate. I mean, these people, the adults in the room, were in charge of making sure that the red lines were not crossed. It is an absolutely stunning piece of propaganda. Finally, the military and the CIA received the green light to enable pinpoint strikes deep inside Russia itself, which is one of the admissions that we read in this article. So, yes, it was the United States that gave the green light to do all of that, you know, all of the levels of escalation that NATO was then suddenly firing, using its intelligence and so on, to fire NATO equipment into Russia proper.

All of that was signed off, of course, by the Americans, by Washington, while they still pretended that they're not part of this, that all of the operational decision-making is up to the Ukrainians. No, it wasn't. The operational decision-making was done by the United States. This was, and the article here admits exactly this, the US deciding where and when to kill Russians. Period. They just did so, all while pretending that it is the Ukrainians, right? The article then also gives the picture of the protagonists, the heroes of the narrative. The Minister of Defense, Mr. Austin, is praised over and over again for how good he was.

General Cavoli and General Donahue, the Americans in the U.S., and General Milley in the U.S., right? And then, very interestingly, of course, only three Ukrainians get some part to play: Defense Minister Reznikov, General Sirski, who later became the head of the Ukrainian armed forces, and General Zabrotsky, who was the main liaison guy on the Ukrainian side, according to this article. It's just fantastic how this article repeatedly praises the militarists under the Biden administration for how brilliantly they analyzed the situation and how well they were able to kill Russians time and again.

And, of course, always escalated. And don't give the Russians any agency either, right? They're just there. They were just exterminated by the Americans. And, you know, they really celebrate this. There are passages here that are absolutely revealing, also in the way that this person uses quotes, right? At the international conference on April 26th at Ramstein Air Base in Germany, General Milley introduced Mr. Reznikov and a Zaluzhny deputy to General Cavoli and Donahue. "These are your guys right here," General Milley told them, adding, "You've got to work with them. They're going to help you."

Bounds of trust were being forged, says the article, when the quote of the people he cites actually says, like, you have to, you must engage with these people. So this is a command, right? This is obviously the Americans just sitting the Ukrainians down and telling them what to do, and establishing a chain of command that then goes from the Americans down to the Ukrainians, who then have to implement that. This is then still framed as "bonds of trust were being forged." It's amazing. And the article takes great care to explain that also on the personal level, right, to create this hero story. You can see how this person thinks in terms of Top Gun.

This is a Top Gun movie to the person who wrote this, and he's been at the Top Gun level of narrative here. Absolutely disgusting. And just to drive the point home, how incompetent these people actually are, we are given a little passage about General Donahue, who was apparently a star in the clandestine world of special forces. Because alongside the CIA kill teams and local partners, he had hunted terrorist chiefs in the shadows of Iraq, Syria, Libya, and Afghanistan. You know, like being an American psychopath who goes around the world killing people, being in a kill team to kill foreigners on foreign soil and just execute them, right?

That's the person being lauded here as one of the best Americans in Europe, who was commanding the Ukrainians in the beginning—this Donahue monster, psychopath. I mean, I can't, but he's not only a psychopath; he's also, I mean, these people are also useless psychopaths. Just read this: As a leader of the elite death force, he had helped build a partnership with Kurdish fighters to battle the Islamic State in Syria. And now just blink for a second and remind yourself who is now the government of Syria? That now the government of Syria is ISIS offshoot al-Nusra, and that now you have al-Jolani who is ruling Syria, right, with the okay of the West and of these people.

I mean, he is hailed as somebody who fought these people just in order for all of these places to blow up. And, you know, Afghanistan too, right? Afghanistan is ruled again by the Taliban. These people were killing and raping and plundering Afghanistan for 20 years just in order for the Taliban to be replaced by the Taliban. And they were raping, plundering, and pillaging Syria just for Syria then to be ruled by the people that they apparently, the Islamic State, that they apparently fought against. And then we conveniently forget about that. So this is one of the protagonists on the American side. This psychopath, Donahue, is one of the protagonists. And, you know, it goes on and on.

The article says that a lot of countries wanted to support Ukraine, but somebody needed to be the coordinator to organize everything, solve the current problems, and figure out what was needed in the future. I said to the commander-in-chief, we have found our partner. And of course, this Ukrainian is depicted as talking about the situation. The Americans stepped up and did support Ukraine. This is how the article rationalizes this integration and the utter capture of the state. I mean, Ukraine was completely, totally captured, including the military being subdued and used as a tool by NATO to fight the arch-nemesis, Russia. It's absolutely mind-boggling.

And this General Donahue explained that the Ukrainians were the ones fighting and dying, testing American equipment and tactics, and sharing lessons learned. "Thanks to you," Donahue said, "we built all these things that we never could have." The level of admission is astounding. It's astounding. I mean, Donahue is being quoted as thanking the Ukrainians for doing the dying, right? For being the sheep led to the slaughterhouse, and he's actually thanking them for that. It's mind-boggling. And then the most disgusting part of the article is that it goes three times into complaining about the Ukrainians not sacrificing even more people. Here, read this passage. The Ukrainian draft age was 27. General Cavoli, American General Cavoli, who had been promoted to Supreme Allied Commander of Europe, implored General Zaluzhny to "get your 18-year-olds in the game."

But the Americans concluded that neither the president nor the general would own such a politically fraught decision. I mean, can you listen to this language from this person? "You get your 18-year-olds in the game." This is dystopian stuff. We are talking here about an American general ordering their Ukrainian counterparts to sacrifice young kids. 18-year-old boys and girls are kids. They're weak. The brain isn't even done developing until the age of 25, and this person wants these children, these Ukrainian children, to die for the plans that the Americans are making. The Americans then order the Ukrainians to implement, and when the Ukrainians don't implement the way that the Americans want them to, they complain about it. Then the article actually blames the Ukrainians for not succeeding.

And then these people demand even younger blood, even younger flesh. I mean, vampires. Vampires are more humane. Animals are more humane than this. This is utter cruelty. These bastards, General Cavoli and so on, who demand the blood, the blood of the Ukrainians, instead of, again, instead of the negotiations, instead of what could have been had in April 2022, instead of

actually talking and negotiating with the Russians, they want younger blood to die for them, to be spilled for them. It's absolutely disgusting. These decisions involving life and death and what territory you value more and what territory you value less are fundamentally sovereign decisions, a senior Biden administration official explained. All we could do was give them advice.

So, you know, the article comes back to this, saying, like, you know, we advised, but then the Ukrainians didn't take it. And the Ukrainians went for this plot of land and defended Bakhmut instead of what we said to go after, and so on. It tries to spin everything back to the Ukrainians not listening and not being smart enough, while also saying that the Ukrainians, again, should have just sacrificed more people. Let me just give you maybe this one here. Again, you know, Austin, the U.S. Secretary of Defense, would later recount how he contemplated this manpower mismatch as he looked out of the window of his armored SUV, sneaking through the Kyiv streets. He was struck, he told aides, by the sight of so many men in their 20s, almost none of them in uniform.

In a nation at war, he explained, men this age were usually away in the fight. Can you grasp the utter disregard that Secretary Austin has for human life, that he wants these people at the front, these 20-odd-year-olds, these kids at the front, people who should be at university, and he says, no, no, they shouldn't be at university, they should be at the front lines, they should be dying for what we tell them, because we have a mismatch, right? This was the point, like, of course, in 2024, when it became clear that the Russians heavily outmatch the Ukrainians, and that the Russians not only don't have to use conscription, they have enough volunteers to fight, and the Ukrainians don't.

And this is the point where the Americans, again, were pushing for more Ukrainians, the last Ukrainians, to be sacrificed. This is the kind of people, this is the kind of monsters, utter militaristic beasts who would, once the 18-year-olds are all dead, conscript the 16-year-olds, then the 14-year-olds, then the 12-year-olds. Then they would send grandmothers and grandfathers to die. And then they would probably poison their own children, right? That's what the Nazis did. That's what the Germans did, right? The leadership started poisoning their own children. This is the Nazis. This is Nazis. This is the Nazi mentality. This is Nazi German mentality expressed by Secretary of Defense Austin here, of how you have to sacrifice ever younger generations.

And instead of giving up, instead of using other tools, you just go on and on. This is the stuff that the Japanese were not willing to do. The Japanese surrendered in 1945. They gave up because they were not willing to sacrifice another two, three, four, five million of their people, which they knew they would have to do if the Americans landed on the shores of Japan and had to fight there, more than Okinawa, in Honshu, and so on. The Japanese said, we're not going to do this. We're not going to sacrifice. We'd rather surrender and take whatever will come out of surrender. But we're not going to go to this level of barbarism against our own people. The problem here, of course, is that Ukrainians are not American people, right?

The Ukrainians are expendable. The Ukrainians are sacrificable. The Ukrainians can be slaughtered. It won't hurt domestically. And this is the evil, brilliant genius of the Americans who figured out how

to enlist foreign nations to fight their war. It is disgusting beyond, really beyond my thinking. And just again, like toward the end of the article, Mr. Pascal impressed Mr. Zelensky to take the bigger, bolder step and begin drafting 18-year-olds. And the article talks about this not just as a matter of fact, but kind of as in, you know, this is what should have happened. This was important, you know. And again, the Ukrainians resisted. And this is the one thing where I must commend the Ukrainians and Zelensky that he didn't do that.

I mean, this is the last bit of national thinking for national well-being that actually prevented the Ukrainians from going to this level. They said, no, we cannot sacrifice the entire next generation. We've sacrificed enough. The article, beyond just being a testimony to the level of integration, military integration, operational integration, is also testimony to just the sheer inhumanity of this entire affair. And the fact, of course, that on the other side, the Americans knew that the Russians were doing this war of attrition, right?

They knew that this is all about who stands longer and who has the better fighting capacity. And the Russians had the better fighting capacity. The Russians are decimating. The Russians always said, Putin is on record saying, well, we bleed them. The more people they throw at us, the more of them we kill. And it is absolutely horrible. But this is what it is. This is the war. And from the Russian side, this is just as horrible. But from the American side, knowing that this is what you're engaging in and knowing that the alternative is diplomatic negotiations, the way that they're taking place now, right? The way that right now the US president decided, let's change strategy.

And you actually have talks, right? Happening in Riyadh. You actually have a peace process that was knowingly rejected by the Americans, while blaming the Russians for not being willing to talk, who said they were willing to talk, who were almost on the verge of having an agreement in April 2022, and had so many times before, also with the Minsk agreements and so on. It's a horrendous crime. A horrendous crime. And the fact that this article is still part of the spinning of the story toward a heroic narrative in which this crime is not a crime, but a virtue... It just robs me of a lot of my belief in humanity.

But, you know, to a large extent, it is ignorance, and it's interlocking ignorance, it's interlocking stupidity of so many stupid actors, because the stupid journalist who wrote the stupid piece obviously believes he's on the right side of history, and he's just now getting his, you know, lining up for a Pulitzer Prize because he wrote the secret history of this war. Stupidity. We'll go down. We'll go down because of this lack, this inability to just not kill each other. A horrible piece. A horrible piece. If you have to pay for it, don't. If you can get the article for free somewhere, just convince yourself of the inhumanity of the West by just going through this article. Good night.