

Skeptic's Alert: Washington and NYT Expose Russian False Flag

By [Kim Petersen](#)

Global Research, January 17, 2022

Region: [Europe](#), [Russia and FSU](#), [USA](#)
Theme: [Media Disinformation](#), [US NATO War Agenda](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the "Translate Website" drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

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

Visit and follow us on Instagram at [@globalresearch_crg](#).

On 14 January, a breaking news [story](#) from the New York Times informed its readers: "U.S. Says Russia Sent Saboteurs Into Ukraine to Create Pretext for Invasion."

Unsurprisingly, Washington "did not release details of the evidence it had collected." Why did the NYT not question the withholding of evidence? Why even deign to report what so easily could be dismissed, by definition, as hearsay? Is that because the White House is a paragon of truth-telling? Did its erroneous reporting by [disgraced writer Judith Miller](#) that Iraq possessed weapons-of-mass-destruction precipitating a US-led invasion not teach NYT a lesson?

U.S. Says Russia Sent Saboteurs Into Ukraine to Create Pretext for Invasion

The Biden administration said the operatives were trained in urban warfare and explosives and could try to stage an incident.



Screenshot from the [New York Times](#)

Nevertheless, the NYT chooses to lend credence to the anti-Russia accusation. It sources **Jen Psaki**, the White House press secretary, who “said the Russian military planned to begin these activities several weeks before a military invasion, which could begin between mid-January and mid-February. She said Moscow was using the same playbook as it did in 2014, when Russia annexed the Crimean Peninsula, a part of Ukraine.”

What does it say about the NYT when it unquestioningly quotes a person or entity? One might well surmise that the NYT has accorded its imprimatur that what has been said is an unquestionable fact. What about relevant background information that is omitted by the NYT?

Since when does a referendum in which 97% of the population chose to join Russia rather than remain a part of Ukraine? Why does this expression of the democratic will constitute an annexation? The US tried to have the referendum ruled illegal in the United Nations Security Council but this was, predictably, quashed by a Russian veto. China abstained noting that Crimea is not a superficial consideration and that there is a “[complex intertwinement of historical and contemporary factors](#).” And how could the UN go against self-determination

for Crimea when that principle is enshrined in Article I of the UN Charter? [UN secretary-general António Guterres](#) said the principle of self-determination “remains both a source of pride for the Organization and a crucial pillar of its work going forward.

Why does the NYT not mention how Crimea became a part of Ukraine in the first place? Is it not pertinent that Crimea became a part of the Ukraine as result of a transfer from Russia by the USSR in 1954? When Ukraine departed the USSR did it still merit keeping Crimea and the Sevastopol Naval Base important for Russian security?

Is it not crucial to mention that the Crimean referendum only took place after a [US-instigated coup](#) that toppled the elected government in Ukraine and saw Neonazis assume governmental office in Kyiv?

Is it journalism to quote a Pentagon official as saying the intelligence about the operation is “very credible”?

The NYT relates that the refusal to reveal evidence is “for fear of alerting the Russian operatives whose movements are being tracked”? What kind of excuse is that? If indeed any of this “intelligence” is true, then the operatives must now know that they were tracked?

Despite all the aforementioned, the NYT seems cocksure about their reporting: “The American allegations were clearly part of a strategy to try to prevent an attack by exposing it in advance.” Those clever Americans thwarting a Russian attack and saving Ukraine without having to fire a shot. Cough, cough.

Among the Russian demands from the nugatory Brussels talks, the NYT notes, without further comment: “Russia has also demanded that the United States remove all of its nuclear weapons from Europe, and that Ukraine, Belarus and Georgia, three surrounding states that once were part of the Soviet empire, never join NATO.”

The current editors at the NYT should know well the history of [the Cuban Missile Crisis](#). Yet the NYT did not connect the dots to Soviet nukes in Cuba and American nukes in Europe. Why were American concerns about nukes across the pond in Cuba a grave security threat while nukes in Europe on Russia’s front porch are not a security threat to Russia?

As a matter of principle, the US-NATO side ought best to consider the security concerns of all actors. And while all the actors are considering, a suggestion: consider declaring continental Europe a nuclear weapon-free zone. It should help anxious Europeans sleep a bit easier.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram, @crg_globalresearch. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Kim Petersen is a former co-editor of the *Dissident Voice* newsletter. He is a regular contributor to *Global Research*. He can be emailed at: kimohp at [gmail.com](mailto:kimohp@gmail.com). Twitter: [@kimpetersen](https://twitter.com/kimpetersen).

Featured image: Russian President Vladimir Putin (ID1974/Shutterstock) and President Joe Biden

(Stratos Brilakis/shutterstock)

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Kim Petersen](#), Global Research, 2022

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Kim Petersen](#)

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