

Confronting NATO's War Summit in Washington

By [Medea Benjamin](#) and [Nicolas J. S. Davies](#)

Global Research, July 01, 2024

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

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

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

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name (only available in desktop version).

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

[Give Truth a Chance. Secure Your Access to Unchained News, Donate to Global Research.](#)

After NATO's catastrophic, illegal invasions of [Yugoslavia](#), [Libya](#) and [Afghanistan](#), on July 9th NATO plans to invade Washington DC. The good news is that it only plans to occupy Washington for three days. The British will not burn down the U.S. Capitol as they did in 1814, and the Germans are still meekly pretending that they [don't know](#) who blew up their Nord Stream gas pipelines. So expect smiling photo-ops and an overblown orgy of mutual congratulation.

The [details](#) of NATO's agenda for the Washington summit were revealed at a NATO foreign ministers' meeting in Prague at the end of May. NATO will drag its members into the U.S. Cold War with China by accusing it of supplying dual-use weapons technology to Russia, and it will unveil new NATO initiatives to spend our tax dollars on a mysterious "drone wall" in the Baltics and an expensive-sounding "integrated air defense system" across Europe.

But the main feature of the summit will be a superficial show of unity to try to convince the public that NATO and Ukraine can defeat Russia and that negotiating with Russia would be tantamount to surrender.

On the face of it, that should be a hard sell. The one thing that most Americans agree on about the war in Ukraine is that they support a negotiated peace. When asked in a November 2023 [Economist/YouGov](#) poll "Would you support or oppose Ukraine and Russia agreeing to a ceasefire now?," 68% said "support," and only 8% said "oppose," while 24% said they were not sure.

However, while President Biden and NATO leaders hold endless debates over different ways to escalate the war, they have repeatedly rejected negotiations, notably in [April 2022](#), [November 2022](#) and [January 2024](#), even as their [failed war plans](#) leave Ukraine in an ever worsening negotiating position.

The endgame of this non-strategy is that Ukraine will only be allowed to negotiate with Russia once it is facing total defeat and has nothing left to negotiate with – exactly the surrender NATO says it wants to avoid.

As other countries have pointed out at the UN [General Assembly](#), the U.S. and NATO's rejection of negotiation and diplomacy in favor of a long war they hope will eventually "weaken" Russia is a flagrant violation of the "Pacific Settlement of Disputes" that all UN members are legally committed to under [Chapter VI](#) of the UN Charter. As it says in Article 33(1),

"The parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice."

But NATO's leaders are not coming to Washington to work out how they can comply with their international obligations and negotiate peace in Ukraine. On the contrary. At a June meeting in preparation for the Summit, NATO defense ministers approved a plan to put NATO's military support to Ukraine "on a [firmer footing](#) for years to come."

The [effort](#) will be headquartered at a U.S. military base in Wiesbaden, Germany, and involve almost 700 staff. It has been described as a way to "[Trump proof](#)" NATO backing for Ukraine, in case Trump wins the election and tries to draw down U.S. support.

At the Summit, NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg wants NATO leaders to commit to providing Ukraine with \$43 billion worth of equipment each year, indefinitely. Echoing George Orwell's doublethink that "war is peace", Stoltenberg said,

"The paradox is that the longer we plan, and the longer we commit [to war], the sooner Ukraine can have peace."

The Summit will also discuss how to bring Ukraine closer to NATO membership, a move that guarantees the war will continue, since Ukrainian neutrality is Russia's principal war aim.

As Ian Davis of NATO Watch [reported](#), NATO's rhetoric echoes the same lines he heard throughout twenty years of war in Afghanistan: "The Taliban (now Russia) can't wait us out." But this vague hope that the other side will eventually give up is not a strategy.

There is no evidence that Ukraine will be different from Afghanistan. The U.S. and NATO are making the same assumptions, which will lead to the same result. The underlying assumption is that NATO's greater GDP, extravagant and corrupt military budgets and fetish for expensive weapons technology must somehow, magically, lead Ukraine to victory over Russia.

When the U.S. and NATO finally admitted defeat in Afghanistan, it was the Afghans who had paid in blood for the West's folly, while the US-NATO war machine simply moved on to its next "challenge," learning nothing and making political hay out of [object denial](#).

Less than three years after the rout in Afghanistan, US Defense Secretary Austin recently [called](#) NATO "the most powerful and successful alliance in history." It is a promising sign for the future of Ukraine that most Ukrainians are [reluctant](#) to throw away their lives in NATO's

dumpster-fire.

In [an article](#) titled “The New Theory of Ukrainian Victory Is the Same as the Old,” the Quincy Institute’s Mark Episkopos wrote,

“Western planning continues to be strategically backwards. Aiding Kyiv has become an end in itself, divorced from a coherent strategy for bringing the war to a close”.

Episkopos concluded that

“the key to wielding [the West’s] influence effectively is to finally abandon a zero-sum framing of victory...”

We would add that this was a trap set by the United States and the United Kingdom, not just for Ukraine, but for their NATO allies too. By refusing to support Ukraine at the negotiating table in April 2022, and instead demanding this “zero-sum framing of victory” as the condition for NATO’s support, the U.S. and U.K. escalated what could have been a very short war into a protracted, potentially nuclear, war between NATO and Russia.

Turkish leaders and diplomats [complained](#) at how their American and British allies undermined their peacemaking, while [France](#), [Italy](#) and [Germany](#) squirmed for a month or two but soon surrendered to the war camp.

When NATO leaders meet in Washington, what they should be doing, apart from figuring out how to comply with [Article 33\(1\)](#) of the UN Charter, is conducting a clear-eyed review of how this organization that claims to be a force for peace keeps escalating unwinnable wars and leaving countries in ruins.

The fundamental question is whether NATO can ever be a force for peace or whether it can never be anything but a dangerous, subservient extension of the U.S. war machine.

We believe that NATO is an anachronism in today’s multipolar world: an aggressive, expansionist military alliance whose inherent institutional myopia and blinkered, self-serving threat assessments condemn us all to endless war and potential nuclear annihilation.

We suggest that the only way NATO could be a real force for peace would be to declare that, by this time next year, it will take the same steps that its counterpart, the Warsaw Pact, took in 1991, and finally dissolve what Secretary Austin would have been wiser to call “the most dangerous military alliance in history.”

However, the world’s population that is suffering under the yoke of militarism cannot afford to wait for NATO to give up and go away of its own accord. Our fellow citizens and political leaders need to hear from us all about the dangers posed by this unaccountable, nuclear-armed war machine, and we hope you will [join us](#)—in person or online—in using the occasion of this NATO summit to sound the alarm loudly.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Medea Benjamin is the cofounder of [CODEPINK for Peace](#), and the author of several books, including [Inside Iran: The Real History and Politics of the Islamic Republic of Iran](#).

Nicolas J. S. Davies is an independent journalist, a researcher for CODEPINK and the author of [Blood on Our Hands: The American Invasion and Destruction of Iraq](#).

Medea Benjamin and Nicolas J. S. Davies are the authors of [War in Ukraine: Making Sense of a Senseless Conflict](#), published by OR Books in November 2022. They are regular contributors to Global Research.

Featured image: Anti-NATO protest in Chicago, 2012. Photo credit: Julie Dermansky.

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Medea Benjamin](#) and [Nicolas J. S. Davies](#), Global Research, 2024

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Medea Benjamin](#)
and [Nicolas J. S. Davies](#)

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