

# Was Nuland Fired for Her Role in the Ukraine Debacle?

By [Mike Whitney](#)

Global Research, March 07, 2024

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

Theme: [Intelligence](#)

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.

## [Global Research Fundraising: Stop the Pentagon's Ides of March](#)

\*\*\*

***Victoria Nuland's** retirement is an admission that Washington's premier foreign policy project has failed. No government official is more identified with the Ukraine fiasco than Nuland. She was on the ground micro-managing activities during the 2014 coup, and has overseen the State Department's sordid involvement since the war began. Her career-path is inextricably linked to the ill-fated NATO-backed disaster which has resulted in the needless deaths of hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian regulars and the obliteration of much of the country. Thus, the question we need to ask ourselves is whether Nuland's persistent machinations to drag NATO into an unwinnable war with Russia is the reason she 'got the axe', er, announced her retirement? Here's an excerpt from the official State Department Press Statement:*

But it's Toria's (Nuland) leadership on Ukraine that diplomats and students of foreign policy will study for years to come. Her efforts have been indispensable to confronting Putin's full-scale invasion of Ukraine and marshaling a global coalition to ensure his strategic failure, and helping Ukraine work toward the day when it will be able to stand strongly on its own feet - democratically, economically, and militarily. [On the Retirement of Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Victoria Nuland](#), US State Department

This is an extraordinary paragraph that places the blame for the Ukrainian debacle squarely on Nuland's shoulders.

Yes, she was "indispensable" in leading the drive to confront Putin just as she played a critical role in "marshaling a global coalition" to prosecute a proxy war on Russia. And, what this statement tells us is that Nuland was one of the main architects of the ongoing conflict, which means she is largely responsible for the widening chasm between the NATO leaders,

the mounting carnage on the battlefield, and America's strategic defeat to its primary geopolitical rival, Russia. In short, no other government official is more responsible for the Ukrainian quagmire than Victoria Nuland.

**Also, Nuland leaves behind a gargantuan catastrophe for which there is no apparent remedy** and no easy way out.

We cannot expect the Biden administration to simply 'cut and run' in what is perceived to be a direct confrontation with Moscow. Biden will undoubtedly press-ahead as a face-saving gesture regardless of the costs, further straining relations with the allies while handing-over large chunks of east Ukraine to the Russian army. This is clearly a no-win situation for Washington which is why (we think) Nuland -who created this mess- got her 'Pink Slip'. Here's more from the State Department's statement:

(Nuland's) tenure caps three and a half decades of remarkable public service under six Presidents and ten Secretaries of State. Starting with her very first posting as a consular officer in Guangzhou, China, Toria's had most of the jobs in this Department. Political officer and economic officer. Spokesperson and chief of staff. Deputy Assistant Secretary and Assistant Secretary. Special Envoy and Ambassador.

These experiences have armed Toria with an encyclopedic knowledge of a wide range of issues and regions, and an unmatched capacity to wield the full toolkit of American diplomacy to advance our interests and values. ([US State Dept](#))

In other words, Victoria Nuland is one of the most knowledgeable and experienced diplomats in the entire State Department, but -even so- **they are throwing her under the bus** during a time of extreme crisis because she failed in the biggest and most important assignment of her 35-year career. Isn't that what they're saying?

It is. You can be 100% certain that a combative street-fighter like Nuland would never throw in the towel unless she was explicitly ordered to leave.

And, perhaps, she might have held-on to her job if there was any sign of progress in the war, but there isn't any sign of progress. It's as hopeless and dire a situation as we have ever seen.

Even as we speak- the Ukrainian front lines are collapsing while the body count continues to rise. Ukraine is out-gunned, out-manned, and out-led. It's a total mismatch and has been ever since Putin called up the reserves over a year ago. Young men are presently being slaughtered in droves and left to rot in mud-filled trenches that stink of gunpowder and death. All of this suggests that the end is near. And if the end is near, then someone will have to be blamed. Enter Nuland with a bullseye affixed to her back.

Nuland deserves whatever she gets. As a diehard Warhawk she has always played fast-and-loose with the facts building the case for war on half-truths and outright fabrications, all with the intention of plunging the country into another pointless bloodletting that would inevitably end in another humiliating defeat. She got her wish, and now she's getting her comeuppance. Here's a short clip from an article by author Karen Kwiatkowski who is equally curious about Nuland's fake retirement:

Is her exit related to Ukraine's ongoing collapse as a nation state or the imminent fall of

Zelensky in another coup, or worse? Perhaps someone is planning another coup in Kiev soon, to try and stop the bleeding, and this time old Vic was not invited. Maybe the CIA is finally deciding to cut their losses in Ukraine, and she was collateral damage. Her replacement is former ambassador John Bass who oversaw the most excellent and well planned withdrawal from Afghanistan a few summers ago. It could simply be rats jumping off sinking ships. Tori was a key player in the bloody and corrupt Ukraine-Biden nexus; one hopes her sudden departure is more significant than just one big nasty murderous rat diving into the deep- may she lead the way for the rest of the neocon mischief. [Bye, Bye, Victoria!](#) Karen Kwiatkowski, *Lew Rockwell*

Nuland and her former colleagues, John Brennan and Hillary Clinton, have had a poisonous effect on our politics, elevating Russophobia to a state religion while dragging the nation's reputation through the mud at every turn. In a Time magazine interview, Nuland boldly announced:

We will support Ukraine for as long as it takes. Ukraine is fighting for the return of all of its land within its international borders. We are supporting them, including in preparing a next hard push to regain their territory...Crimea must be—at a minimum, at a minimum—demilitarized." [Time Magazine](#)

Nonsense. Is there anyone who still believes this load of malarkey?

"As long as it takes" probably means another 10 to 12 months at the most. By then, Washington will have withdrawn its support and shifted its attention to Taiwan. Bet on it.

In any event, we think that Nuland's retirement is anything but voluntary. We think that she's being terminated by foreign policy elites who no longer believe in her blustery rhetoric and empty promises of beating Putin. By removing Nuland they are acknowledging that the proxy-war has failed and that a different strategy is needed. And while we don't yet know what that policy-change will entail, we do know that Nuland won't be involved in its implementation.

One final comment: In a February 22, 2024 interview at the prestigious Center for Strategic and International Studies, Nuland was asked the following question:

"...if Congress doesn't act (to provide additional funding for Ukraine)... is there a Plan B? Is the administration thinking about how it could get aid to Ukraine? Is there a way to get aid to Ukraine without Congress actually allocating the funding to do so?

Nuland: Max, we're on Plan A. We're on Plan A. And, frankly, you know, the U.S. Senate just passed this bill with 70 votes. So that tells you that the American people strongly support continuing to help Ukraine, in Ukraine's interest but also in our own interest. So I think the question, as the House of Representatives goes out into its districts, what message are constituents giving to their members of Congress? And how are members of Congress understanding what the world looks like, and how they're going to have to answer if they don't support this funding? So I am an optimist on this front. I think we will get there. But I think the American people need to speak strongly to their members. [Under Secretary of State Victoria Nuland: The Two-Year Anniversary of Russia's Full-Scale Invasion of Ukraine](#), CSIS Center for Strategic and International Studies

Did you hear what she said? There is no Plan B. Either the US prevails in its proxy-war with

Russia or what? Chaos? A Russian takeover of all Ukraine? The dissolution of NATO? What?

This is not the type of response that powerful foreign policy elites (who attended the interview) want to hear. They know that Ukraine is not winning the war, just like they know that Ukraine's chances of success are extremely poor unless they get more money, more troops and more firepower, all of which are now seriously in doubt. They also know that the State Department has not convened any back-channel negotiations with Russia, so there's no possibility of a surprise settlement either. And, now Nuland is telling them that neither she nor her colleagues have formulated a back-up plan in the event the war doesn't turn out as they had anticipated. No Plan B.

This is unbelievable. Nuland is either supremely arrogant or criminally negligent, one or the other. Whichever it is, we can understand why elite powerbrokers may have decided it was time to put the irascible Ms. Nuland out to pasture.

Regrettably, we don't think that 'changing the messenger' necessarily means a fundamental rethinking of the policy. Even so, it is a step in the right direction. As America's 'air of invincibility' continues to erode, and its moral authority collapses (Gaza), Washington will be forced to pull in its horns and 'play nice' with its neighbors. That day is fast approaching.

Finally, no matter how you look at it, dumping Nuland is a positive development. Savor the moment.

\*

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.

*This article was originally published on [The Unz Review](#).*

**Michael Whitney** is a renowned geopolitical and social analyst based in Washington State. He initiated his career as an independent citizen-journalist in 2002 with a commitment to honest journalism, social justice and World peace.

*He is a Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG).*

*Featured image is from TUR*

The original source of this article is Global Research  
Copyright © [Mike Whitney](#), Global Research, 2024

---

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Mike Whitney](#)

**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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)