

Neocon Queen Victoria Nuland ADMITS Not Wanting to End Ukraine War Diplomatically

This transcript may not be 100% accurate due to audio quality or other factors.

Glenn Greenwald (GG): A video emerged where this interviewer, Mikhail Zygar, interviewed Victoria Nuland, who used to be Dick Cheney's top foreign policy adviser, then ran Ukraine for Hillary Clinton and John Kerry, and now runs Ukraine for Joe Biden. The only time she was out of power was when Donald Trump was in office. She's now left the government, I think, in part because she didn't get the promotion she wanted. She wanted to be secretary of state, it didn't look like she was going to get it. So she's out for now, but she's still the architect, one of the main architects, not only of the war in Ukraine, but also the ten year earlier coup that led to the ousting of the democratically elected president. He was too close to Moscow in the view of Victoria Nuland and replaced by somebody she chose who the US could better control. And she's asked here about reports that at the very start, there were active, robust negotiations between the Ukrainians and Russians to resolve this before it became this war. And that the UK under Boris Johnson, and especially the US as well, intervened and put a stop to those negotiations to make sure that this war continued instead, it wasn't peacefully resolved. And here's what she said when asked.

Mikhail Zygar (MZ): There was a story first told by former Israeli Prime Minister Naftali Bennett that both sides were really close to the end, to the successful end of the negotiations. And then Prime Minister Boris Johnson interfered and stopped and prevented the Ukrainians from signing the deal. And then Ukrainian representative Arakhama kind of confirmed that. Yes, he said in an interview that there was some kind of advice from Boris Johnson to stop negotiating and to win this war militarily. Where is the myth? Where is the truth?

GG: I mean look at that nauseating grin. But I just want to make clear what that question was. He wasn't just asking: Hey, by the way, were there some negotiations that you stopped? He was citing extremely knowledgeable first hand sources such as the prime minister of Israel at the time, Naftali Bennett, and even high level members of the Ukrainian parliament who have said publicly, there was a ton of progress between Moscow and Kiev early in the war, February and March, where essentially Ukraine would agree not to seek NATO membership, it would provide a sort of semi-autonomous zone in the eastern part of Ukraine

as well as in Crimea – where by the way, the people of Crimea, the people in east Ukraine identify far more with Russia than they do with the Zelensky government in Ukraine – and that essentially it would assuage Russia's concerns without having the Ukrainians face a destruction of a generation of men by dying in a war and the destruction of their country and leaving it as a rump state. So there's people who, with very reliable knowledge, have said explicitly that that was happening and that it was the British and Americans who intervened and put a stop to those negotiations. And that's what as she sits there and grins, this is what the interviewer asked for, and here's what she said.

Victoria Nuland (VN): Relatively late in the game, the Ukrainians began asking for advice on where this thing was going. And it became clear to us, clear to the Brits, clear to others that Putin's main condition was buried in an annex to this document that they were working on. And it included limits on the precise kinds of weapons systems that Ukraine could have after the deal, such that Ukraine would basically be neutered as a military force.

GG: And let me just say, first of all, notice here that the whole premise, the conceit of that entire answer is: Oh, the Ukrainians were really dumb. They thought they had the chance to make a deal with Russians. But we, their masters in London and Washington, we saw something they didn't understand that buried in this appendix was the real Putin goal, namely that he wanted to limit the amount of weapons that were present on Ukrainian soil, precisely because the West has long been saying that they're going to make Ukraine part of NATO. The West changed the government in Kiev right on the other side of the most sensitive border. And in case you think that that's some kind of unprecedented condition. The reason the Cuban missile crisis happened is because the Cuban government, after the failed Bay of Pigs operation in 1961, to overthrow the Castro government, which the CIA led and failed to accomplish, wanted security against future US attempts to invade and engineer a coup. And so they asked the Soviet Union, will you put nuclear weapons in our country as protection against US invasions? And the Soviet Union did; had nuclear submarines around Cuba. That was what the Cuban Missile Crisis was about. The United States said, we will absolutely not accept the presence of these weapons in a country 90 miles from our most southern border in Florida. And not only did that almost lead to war, it almost led to a nuclear war. It was just a matter of luck that it did not. Just to give you a sense for how dangerous these things can spiral. So, of course, the Russians don't want extremely threatening weapons in Ukraine, because of what is happening now, namely that they now have very sophisticated long range missiles that they're now been given the green light to shoot deep into Russian territory. And I assume those were negotiable, those limits. Those limits are all over the place. We obviously don't allow certain kinds of weapons to be in certain countries where we feel threatened by it. We do that all the time. But the idea that she would sit there so smugly, be like, Yeah, we did, they asked for our advice. They didn't ask for her advice. They knew that they had to do what they were told by Washington in Britain because that's who was going to fund them and arm them and protect them. There wasn't an equal relationship. They had to do what they were told in the message from London and Washington. And she's admitting, while she smirks, is like, Yeah, we looked at this deal and we're like, No, you can't do that. You have to get your country go up in flames, sorry, this is not a deal we can accept.

VN: There were no similar constraints on Russia. Russia wasn't required to pull back. Russia wasn't required to have a buffer zone from the Ukrainian border, wasn't required to have the same constraints on its military facing Ukraine. And so people inside Ukraine and people outside Ukraine started asking questions about whether this was a good deal. And it was at that point that it fell apart.

GG: It fell apart because people inside Ukraine, the ones who were asking the advice, also she said, people outside Ukraine, meaning me, the master of Ukraine, sitting there smirking over the fact that she sabotaged a peace deal. But had it been permitted to go forward, not only would it have saved hundreds of billions dollars in American money, which no one cares about, keep pouring that into Raytheon and General Dynamics at Boeing, that's what it's for, but also would have saved hundreds of thousands of lives of both young Russian men and young Ukrainian men would have averted the complete destruction of Ukraine, what will be the reconstruction of it through JP Morgan and BlackRock and a whole bunch of other vulture funds that will profiteer off it at the expense of the American taxpayer as usual. She's proud of the fact that she intervened with Boris Johnson to veto any negotiations. She wanted that war to go forward. She desperately wanted it. And they admit it now. They say that, Look, this is a great war for us. We haven't had to sacrifice a single one of our soldiers or a single one of our citizens. We're just forcing Ukrainians to die. And if they don't want to fight, we're taking them at gunpoint or putting them in prison or threatening to execute them if they desert. They're the only ones dying. So it's great for us and we get to weaken Russia at the same time. Even Russia is not actually being weakened. So this should forever and any doubt about this obviously truthful historical narrative that the reason why this war wasn't diplomatically resolved at the beginning was because Victoria Nuland and Boris Johnson vetoed it because they knew they weren't going to be the ones who suffered. Instead, they were going to be the ones who benefited.

Thanks for watching this clip from System Update, our live show that airs every Monday through Friday at 7 p.m. Eastern exclusively on Rumble. You can catch the full nightly shows live or view the backlog of episodes for free on our Rumble page. You can also find full episodes the morning after they air across all major podcasting platforms, including Spotify and Apple. All the information you need is linked below. We hope to see you there.

END

Thank you for reading this transcript. Please don't forget to donate to support our independent and non-profit journalism:

BANKKONTO:
Kontoinhaber: acTVism München e.V.
Bank: GLS Bank
IBAN: DE89430609678224073600
BIC: GENODEM1GLS

PAYPAL:
E-Mail: PayPal@acTVism.org

PATREON:
<https://www.patreon.com/acTVism>

BETTERPLACE:
Link: [Click here](#)

The acTVism Munich e.V. association is a non-profit organization with legal capacity. The association pursues exclusively and directly non-profit and charitable purposes. Donations from Germany are tax-deductible. If you require a donation receipt, please send us an e-mail to: info@acTVism.org