

The Road to War: How the Ukraine War Began - A Factual Accounting With Document Proof from US National Security Archive

HAL haltunnerradioshow.com/index.php/news-selections/world-news/the-road-to-war-how-the-ukraine-war-began-a-factual-accounting-with-document-proof-from-us-national-security-archive

Hal Turner



Vladimir Putin did not wake up on 24 February 2022 and decide, "I think I'll invade eastern Ukraine today," nor was the US campaign to expand NATO into Ukraine a last-minute maneuver. (US State Department documents show Ukraine's future membership was discussed as early as 1994.)

Nowadays, descriptions and explanations about situations, have to be small because so many people in the general public have small minds. In fact, it's amazing how their small minds can generate enough energy to make their mouths move; but move them they do!

You can tell who has the small minds because they're the one's with Ukraine flags in their social media accounts, and anytime they hear the facts, they discount them as "Russian talking points." Such people are literally the stupidest among us and cannot be taken seriously.

I caution you that this read is too big for small-minded people. We adults have to deal with big reads because, well, we're adults.

So those of you who have small minds, the low intellect that goes along with it, and who cannot grasp actual historical facts, need to move on to some cartoon or video that better suits your limited intellect.

This stuff is real-life, life-and-death and if you're one of the small-minded idiots in the general public, you won't be able to grasp this . . . because you're dumb.

The Road to War... between Russia and Ukraine:

9 Feb 1990: In a deal approved by Mikhail Gorbachev, the last leader of the Soviet Union, as a quid pro quo for accepting German reunification in NATO, Secretary of State James Baker pledged that NATO would not expand “one inch to the east.”

Columbia professor Jeffrey Sachs and Chicago professor John Mearsheimer argue that during the lengthy negotiations on German unification, US, European and German leaders made explicit assurances to Gorbachev that there would be no future NATO expansion eastward.

US National Security Archive Documents PROVE this promise was made to Gorbachev by then US Secretary of State, James Baker III during a meeting in the Kremlin, on February 9, 1990.

**US Secretary of State, James Baker, addressing Gorbachev, 9 February 1990,
at the Kremlin, Moscow, on a unified Germany joining NATO + no NATO expansion**

UNCLASSIFIED



United States Department of State
Washington, D.C. 20520

Memcon from 2/9/90
meeting w/USSR Pres.
Gorbachev & FM
Shevardnadze, Moscow,
USSR

(3) E2

#9

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

Date: Friday, February 9, 1990
Time: 1:00 pm - 3:00 pm
Place: Kremlin

PARTICIPANTS: Secretary Baker
President Gorbachev
Eduard Shevardnadze

RELEASED IN PART
B1, 1.5(B), 1.5(D)

We understand the need for assurances to the countries in the East. If we maintain a presence in a Germany that is a part of NATO, there would be no extension of NATO's jurisdiction for forces of NATO one inch to the east. At the end of the day, if it is acceptable to everyone, we could have discussions in a two plus four context that might achieve this kind of an outcome. Maybe there is a better way to deal with the external consequences of German unification. And if there is I am not aware of it. We don't have German agreement but we have mentioned it to Genscher and he said he wants to think about it. Dumas liked it and now I have mentioned it to you.

Source: US National Security Archive

Even if only verbal and not in a formal treaty, Gorbachev understood the assurances as a "binding agreement." Subsequently, Soviet leaders made decisions on that basis and acted on them - **withdrawing the Red Army from Germany and dissolving the Warsaw Pact.**

1996 Election Year: With an eye on the Polish and Eastern European vote in northern Illinois, **Bill Clinton campaigned on enlarging NATO into Eastern Europe.** (Bill Clinton carried Illinois and handily defeated Bob Dole.)

12 March 1999: The Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland join NATO. A weakened post-Soviet Russia, led by Boris Yeltsin, whose economy was controlled by a bevy of Oligarchs, could do nothing about it. Powerless, Yeltsin was "infuriated" with "his friend Bill Clinton" for breaking with past US assurances on NATO expansion.

31 Dec 1999: After years of heavy drinking and suffering from health problems, Boris Yeltsin unexpectedly resigned. Vladimir Putin becomes Prime Minister of Russia. Yeltsin's last words to Putin: "Take care of Russia."

29 March 2004: George W. Bush is now president, and seven more Eastern European countries join NATO: Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia - largest wave of NATO enlargement in its history.

April 2008: At the NATO summit in Bucharest, **George W. Bush announces that Ukraine and Georgia are on an “immediate path to NATO.”** German Chancellor Angela Merkel: “I was very sure that Putin was not going to just let that happen. From his perspective, **this would be a declaration of war,**” she recalled in 2022.

2008: Bill Burns, ambassador to Russia, sent a memo to Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice: Across the board, he wrote, the Russian political class told him, “Ukraine is the reddest of red lines” – “Nyet means nyet.”

The memo, CLASSIFIED, was ultimately leaked to WikiLEAKS and made public. That memo spells-out that the US and NATO all knew, asking Ukraine to join NATO would have serious ramifications, up to and including war with Russia! Here is that CLASSIFIED memo:

PUBLIC LIBRARY OF US DIPLOMACY

- Specified Search
- View Map
- Make Timegraph
- View Tags
- Image Library

NYET MEANS NYET: RUSSIA'S NATO ENLARGEMENT REDLINES

Date: 2008 February 1, 14:25 (Friday)

Canonical ID: 08MOSCOW265_a

Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL

Current Classification: CONFIDENTIAL

Handling Restrictions -- Not Assigned --

Character Count: 9713

Executive Order: -- Not Assigned --

Locator: TEXT ONLINE

Tags: NATO - North Atlantic Treaty Organization | PREL - Political Affairs- External Political Relations | RS - Russia | UP - Ukraine

Concepts: -- Not Assigned --

Enclosure: -- Not Assigned --

Type: TE - Telegram (cable)

Office Origin: -- N/A OR BLANK --

Archive Status: -- Not Assigned --

Office Action: -- N/A OR BLANK --

Markings: -- Not Assigned --

From: RUSSIA MOSCOW

Linked documents or other documents with the same ID: 08MOSCOW2653_a 08MOSCOW2655_a 08MOSCOW2656_a

To: JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF | NATO - EUROPEAN UNION COOPERATIVE | NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL | RUSSIA MOSCOW POLITICAL COLLECTIVE | SECRETARY OF DEFENSE | SECRETARY OF STATE

Content

Raw content

Metadata

Share

Print

Show Headers

B. MOSCOW 182

Classified By: Ambassador William J. Burns. Reasons 1.4 (b) and (d).

1. (C) Summary. Following a muted first reaction to Ukraine's intent to seek a NATO Membership Action Plan (MAP) at the Bucharest summit (ref A), Foreign Minister Lavrov and other senior officials have reiterated strong opposition, stressing that Russia would view further eastward expansion as a potential military threat. NATO enlargement, particularly to Ukraine, remains "an emotional and neuralgic" issue for Russia, but strategic policy considerations also underlie strong opposition to NATO membership for Ukraine and Georgia. In Ukraine, these include fears that the issue could potentially split the country in two, leading to violence or even, some claim, civil war, which would force Russia to decide whether to intervene. Additionally, the GOR and experts continue to claim that Ukrainian NATO membership would have a major impact on Russia's defense industry, Russian-Ukrainian family connections, and bilateral relations generally. In Georgia, the GOR fears continued instability and "provocative acts" in the separatist regions. End summary.

MFA: NATO Enlargement "Potential Military Threat to Russia"

2. (U) During his annual review of Russia's foreign policy January 22-23 (ref B), Foreign Minister Lavrov stressed that Russia had to view continued eastward expansion of NATO, particularly to Ukraine and Georgia, as a potential military threat. While Russia might believe statements from the West that NATO was not directed against Russia, when one looked at recent military activities in NATO countries (establishment of U.S. forward operating locations, etc. they had to be

evaluated not by stated intentions but by potential. Lavrov stressed that maintaining Russia's "sphere of influence" in the neighborhood was anachronistic, and acknowledged that the U.S. and Europe had "legitimate interests" in the region. But, he argued, while countries were free to make their own decisions about their security and which political-military structures to join, they needed to keep in mind the impact on their neighbors.

3. (U) Lavrov emphasized that Russia was convinced that enlargement was not based on security reasons, but was a legacy of the Cold War. He disputed arguments that NATO was an appropriate mechanism for helping to strengthen democratic governments. He said that Russia understood that NATO was in search of a new mission, but there was a growing tendency for new members to do and say whatever they wanted simply because they were under the NATO umbrella (e.g. attempts of some new member countries to "rewrite history and glorify fascists").

4. (U) During a press briefing January 22 in response to a question about Ukraine's request for a MAP, the MFA said "a radical new expansion of NATO may bring about a serious political-military shift that will inevitably affect the security interests of Russia." The spokesman went on to stress that Russia was bound with Ukraine by bilateral obligations set forth in the 1997 Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation and Partnership in which both parties undertook to "refrain from participation in or support of any actions capable of prejudicing the security of the other Side." The spokesman noted that Ukraine's "likely integration into NATO would seriously complicate the many-sided Russian-Ukrainian relations," and that Russia would "have to take appropriate measures." The spokesman added that "one has the impression that the present Ukrainian leadership regards rapprochement with NATO largely as an alternative to good-neighborly ties with the Russian Federation."

Russian Opposition Neuralgic and Concrete

5. (C) Ukraine and Georgia's NATO aspirations not only touch a raw nerve in Russia, they engender serious concerns about the consequences for stability in the region. Not only does Russia perceive encirclement, and efforts to undermine Russia's influence in the region, but it also fears unpredictable and uncontrolled consequences which would seriously affect Russian security interests. Experts tell us that Russia is particularly worried that the strong divisions in Ukraine over NATO membership, with much of the ethnic-Russian community against membership, could lead to a major split, involving violence or at worst, civil war. In that eventuality, Russia would have to decide whether to intervene; a decision Russia does not want to have to face.

6. (C) Dmitry Trenin, Deputy Director of the Carnegie Moscow Center, expressed concern that Ukraine was, in the long-term, the most potentially destabilizing factor in U.S.-Russian relations, given the level of emotion and neuralgia triggered by its quest for NATO membership. The letter requesting MAP consideration had come as a "bad surprise" to Russian officials, who calculated that Ukraine's NATO aspirations were safely on the backburner. With its public letter, the issue had been "sharpened." Because membership remained divisive in Ukrainian domestic politics, it created an opening for Russian intervention. Trenin expressed concern that elements within the Russian establishment would be encouraged to meddle, stimulating U.S. overt encouragement of opposing political forces, and leaving the U.S. and Russia in a classic confrontational posture. The irony, Trenin professed, was that Ukraine's membership would defang NATO, but neither the Russian public nor elite opinion was ready for that argument. Ukraine's gradual shift towards the West was one thing, its preemptive status as a de jure U.S. military ally another. Trenin cautioned strongly against letting an internal Ukrainian fight for power, where MAP was merely a lever in domestic politics, further complicate U.S.-Russian relations now.

7. (C) Another issue driving Russian opposition to Ukrainian membership is the significant defense industry cooperation the two countries share, including a number of plants where Russian weapons are made. While efforts are underway to shut down or move most of these plants to Russia, and to move the Black Sea fleet from Sevastopol to Novorossiysk earlier than the 2017 deadline, the GOR has made clear that Ukraine's joining NATO would require Russia to make major (costly) changes to its defense industrial cooperation.

8. (C) Similarly, the GOR and experts note that there would also be a significant impact on Russian-Ukrainian economic and labor relations, including the effect on thousands of Ukrainians living and working in Russia and vice versa, due to the necessity of imposing a new visa regime. This, Aleksandr Konovalov, Director of the Institute for Strategic Assessment, argued, would become a boiling cauldron of anger and resentment among the local population.

9. (C) With respect to Georgia, most experts said that while not as neuralgic to Russia as Ukraine, the GOR viewed the situation there as too unstable to withstand the divisiveness NATO membership could cause. Aleksey Arbatov, Deputy Director of the Carnegie Moscow Center, argued that Georgia's NATO aspirations were simply a way to solve its problems in Abkhazia and South Ossetia, and warned that Russia would be put in a difficult situation were that to ensue.

Russia's Response

10. (C) The GOR has made it clear that it would have to "seriously review" its entire relationship with Ukraine and Georgia in the event of NATO inviting them to join. This could include major impacts on energy, economic, and political-military engagement, with possible repercussions throughout the region and into Central and Western Europe. Russia would also likely revisit its own relationship with the Alliance and activities in the NATO-Russia Council, and consider further actions in the arms control arena, including the possibility of complete withdrawal from the CFE and INF Treaties, and more direct threats against U.S. missile defense plans.

11. (C) Isabelle Francois, Director of the NATO Information Office in Moscow (protect), said she believed that Russia had accepted that Ukraine and Georgia would eventually join NATO and was engaged in long-term planning to reconfigure its relations with both countries, and with the Alliance. However, Russia was not yet ready to deal with the consequences of further NATO enlargement to its south. She added that while Russia liked the cooperation with NATO in the NATO-Russia Council, Russia would feel it necessary to insist on recasting the NATO-Russia relationship, if not withdraw completely from the NRC, in the event of Ukraine and Georgia joining NATO.

Comment

12. (C) Russia's opposition to NATO membership for Ukraine and Georgia is both emotional and based on perceived

strategic concerns about the impact on Russia's interests in the region. It is also politically popular to paint the U.S. and NATO as Russia's adversaries and to use NATO's outreach to Ukraine and Georgia as a means of generating support from Russian nationalists. While Russian opposition to the first round of NATO enlargement in the mid-1990's was strong, Russia now feels itself able to respond more forcefully to what it perceives as actions contrary to its national interests.

BURNS

References to this document in other cables
08MOSCOW806

References in this document to other cables
10MOSCOW147
08MOSCOW147

If the reference is ambiguous all possibilities are listed.

William Joseph Burns, who signed the memo above "BURNS" became the 8th director of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) during the Biden administration from March 19, 2021 to January 20, 2025.

He tucked tail and ran when Trump got sworn-in for a Second Term because he KNEW he allowed this Ukraine thing to become a war when none of it had to be.

Back to the Historical Time-line:

22 Feb 2014: Just as the Sochi Winter Olympics got underway, the “Maidan” coup in Kyiv erupted in violence. **State Department official Virginia Nuland boasted that since the 2004-2005 “Orange Revolution,” the US had spent \$5 billion on regime change in Ukraine.**

Nuland made that boast on a telephone call which was intercepted by Russian Intelligence, and made public.



Watch Video At: <https://youtu.be/LUCCR4jAS3Y>

(Continuing on 22 Feb 2014) NATO rooftop snipers killed both protestors and police, forcing Ukraine’s democratically elected pro-Russian leader Viktor Yanukovych to flee. In response to Yanukovych’s downfall, Putin stepped up Russian support for Russian-speaking separatist rebels in the Donbass, while US accelerated its efforts to arm and train Ukraine’s army.

NATO sent Snipers into the Maidan Revolution in Ukraine, to make it more violent!!!!!! NATO knew it was overthrowing Ukraine's democratically-elected President, and they did it anyway. So all those who say Russia's invasion into Ukraine was "unprovoked" are either completely ignorant of the facts, or lying.

After Ukraine President Yanukovych was forced to flee the country, United States Senator Chris Smith (D-CT) went on C-SPAN and boasted that we in the United States, working on the ground during the riots, helped impose **"regime change" in Ukraine.** Here is video in which he admits it:

2 May 2014: The Donbass crisis point of no return: Bussed to Odessa from Kyiv, Right Sector thugs carrying baseball bats confront ethnic Russians protesting the coup in Kyiv. When protestors fled into the city's Trade Unions House, the building was set on fire. **Forty-eight people that day were burned or bludgeoned to death.**

11 Feb 2015: Putin and then-Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko meet with French President Francois Hollande and German Chancellor Angela Merkel in Minsk, Belarus, known as the multi-year Minsk accords.

The leaders agreed to a deal that would have ended fighting in eastern Ukraine - granted autonomy to the Russian-speaking Donbass. Successive Ukrainian governments, however, refused to implement the accord. **German Chancellor Merkel later admitted that Minsk was a stall tactic to allow the West to build Ukraine's army up to NATO standards.**

Merkel KNEW her presence at the Minsk Conference was a complete RUSE. She went to it with the INTENTION TO DECEIVE, to buy time, for the West to arm Ukraine for war with Russia. *(HT REMARK: Do any of you Readers still think the war was "unprovoked?")*

31 Dec 2016, New Year's Eve, **twenty days before the incoming Trump admin, Lindsey Graham,** with a bi-partisan group of US Senators, visited Ukrainian troops on the civil war Line of Contact, encouraging them to take the war to Russia: **"Your fight is our fight. . . "**

Senator Graham and former Senator John McCain actually GOADED the troops to attack Russia! Video proof:

17 Dec 2021: Team Biden rejects Putin's proposed mutual security accords that would have left "neutral" Ukraine intact. For years, Russia tried to convince successive US administrations that Ukraine was off-limits to NATO membership, but Russian concerns were brushed aside. In December 2021, Team Biden insisted, "Russia doesn't say who can join NATO."

18 Feb 2022: During the Winter Olympics in China, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) documented that Ukraine was ramping up artillery attacks along the Line of Contact. *(Since the 2014 coup in Kyiv, the **Armed forces of Ukraine, including the Neo-Nazi Banderites, had already killed 14,000 Donbass ethnic Russians.**)*

19 Feb 2022: Invited to speak at the Munich Security Conference, Ukrainian President Zelensky said **"Ukraine will get and deploy nuclear missiles."**

20 Feb 2022: On CBS' 60 Minutes, final day of the Olympics in China, **Ukraine's Minister of Foreign Affairs Dmytro Kuleba said, "Ukraine will never honor the Minsk cease fire."**

21 Feb 2022: Russia captured a Ukrainian soldier, killed five others as they crossed over the border into Rostov. Russia learned the invasion of Donetsk city was imminent and recognized the breakaway Donbass and Luhansk oblasts as independent republics.

24 Feb 2022: With 90,000 troops, Russia launched its limited "Special Military Operation" - not a "full scale invasion." Citing the UN principle, "Responsibility to Protect," Russia finally intervened in the eight-year Donbass crisis after all prospects for diplomacy had failed.

March-April 2022, week six of the invasion, Russia and Ukraine convened peace talks in Istanbul. Ukrainian diplomat Oleksandr Chalyi said the two sides "managed to find a compromise" - and "were very close to finalizing the war with a peaceful settlement."

Later, Chalyi recalled, "Putin tried to do everything possible to conclude an agreement with Ukraine." **But Joe Biden and Boris Johnson, who flew to Kyiv, urged Zelensky to "keep fighting; we have your back."** Under pressure, Zelensky chose to walk away from peace.

The future of the world order may not hinge on who wins the war on the Russian steppes, unless, of course, events spiral into a nuclear catastrophe - a scenario that cannot be ruled out; however, right now, for Russia, Ukraine and NATO, there is no escaping the battle, and, as of 3 March 2025, no one is getting ready to back down.

HAL TURNER EDITORIAL OPINION

The irrefutable facts reported above cannot be disputed or explained-away. The US National Security Archive document PROVES that the US promised "NATO will not move one inch east" and later, it was President Bill Clinton who BROKE THAT PROMISE and signed approval of NATO doing exactly that. Need proof? Here is the photo of Bill Clinton doing it:



It has been we in the United States, and our NATO vassals, who have planned every step of the ongoing situation, and did so for YEARS. The war in Ukraine is OUR FAULT.

We are in the wrong. We gave our word to Gorbachev that "NATO will not move one inch east" and we BROKE OUR WORD.

I am sick to death of hearing about Russia's "illegal and unprovoked invasion." Russia is defending itself from NATO expansion. Self-Defense is legal. And as for "unprovoked" no rational person can make any such claim; we in the collective West provoked this over and over again.

These are the facts and they are not in dispute.

We have the names. We have the dates. We have proof of the actions. When are these people going to be arrested for starting a war that has killed over a MILLION Ukrainians and Russians? Or is starting a war not a crime?