

America's "Nuclear Primacy" Strategy: It Is Only a Nano-second to Armageddon

By [Dr. Paul Craig Roberts](#)

Global Research, July 21, 2022

Region: [Asia](#), [USA](#)

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

In-depth Report: [Nuclear War](#)

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](#).

Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

The U.S. Government's "[Nuclear Primacy](#)" meta-strategy says that there are "acceptable" levels of destruction of America in a nuclear war against Russia and/or China, so long as America "comes out on top" globally, at the end.

Brian Berletic walks us through the Rand Corporation's plan for the Pentagon to attack China during the narrow window until 2025 and perhaps 2030 (3 to 8 years from today) when the US is assumed to still have superiority capable of winning a war that is "unlikely" (undefined and little more than a wishful assumption) to go nuclear.

In other words, the assumption on which Washington's planned military attack on China rests is that China will accept defeat rather than use nuclear weapons.

Would a sane government start a war on such a risky assumption?

There are two other highly risky assumptions in the Pentagon's war plans. One is that the US can dominate the seas from which via airplanes or missiles the US can cause destruction to Chinese industry and social infrastructure. Apparently no attention has been paid to long-range Chinese missiles that make US carrier fleets obsolete.

The other risky assumption is that Russia stays out of it. Considering the confusion in the Kremlin, the inability of the Russian government to give up hope of peaceful cooperation with the West, and the inability of the Kremlin to regard the neoconservative doctrine of US hegemony over the world as anything but a fantasy, and most certainly not an operative doctrine, it is possible that the Kremlin would strand aside and watch a US/China war.

The Kremlin misses many opportunities, but it is difficult to believe that Putin would be so stupid as to not gang up with China on the US. In which case the US is history.

You can read Berletic's analysis [here](#).

As for the Pentagon's concern for Americans in the event that the assumption that Washington can conquer China without nuclear weapons being used is mistaken, if such weapons are employed,

“the U.S. Government's ‘Nuclear Primacy’ meta-strategy says that there are ‘acceptable’ levels of destruction of America in a nuclear war against Russia and/or China, so long as America ‘comes out on top’ globally.”

The Pentagon's doctrine doesn't say how many American cities and how many millions of Americans are among the “acceptable levels of destruction.” But it is enough to show that Americans are regarded as canon fodder by their rulers.

You see, the only importance in the ruling neoconservative doctrine is US hegemony, not your life. For the neocons, as long as America rules over a wasteland devoid of life, we have won. Neocons are truly insane people, and they are in control of US foreign and military policy.

That should scare you and wake you up. But it won't. The young can't stop scrolling their cell phones long enough to have any idea of the reality around them. They already live in a virtual world, disconnected from all reality. Older Americans say they have heard fears of nuclear war all their lives and it is never going to happen because there can be no winners. This is a very unsophisticated understanding, especially in the face of a US war doctrine that says Washington can win a nuclear war as long as it doesn't wait beyond 2025 or 2030.

Eric Zuesse, stimulated by Berletic, writes that Washington intends to conquer both China and Russia. See [this](#). The opening battlefield of WW III is the war Washington arranged in Ukraine.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Russian military is very formidable and is capable of sweeping through NATO in an instant. The problem for Russia is in the Kremlin where hesitancy and confusion rule. The Kremlin is unable to get its mind around the fact that Washington is insane. Putin actually thought that Washington would accept Russia's military intervention in Ukraine as it was limited to the protection of the Donbass Russians. Putin and his foreign minister are so insouciant that they believed Washington would allow them to conduct a limited operation confined to cleansing Donbass of Ukrainian Nazis.

How does the world's most predominant military power make such a mistake? The only answer I can come up with is that America's brainwashing of the Russian intellectual class during the Yeltsin years has made Russian leadership, deaf, dumb, and blind. One is tempted to add stupid. Russia's leaders—Putin, Lavrov—correctly describe the situation, but they cannot bring themselves to do anything about it. Talk is plentiful but action is rare. Apparently the Kremlin is going to continue to sell the energy to NATO countries so that NATO can continue the war on Russia. To paraphrase Alain de Lille in the 11th century, not sovereignty now, but money is all. This appears to hold for Russia.

Zuesse who is as honest as a leftwinger can be, is not always reliable. The left have their own myths about Reagan, and here is Zuesse's statement of one of them:

“I have [documented](#) that the plan by America's Government was instead to fool Russia's Government [Gorbachev] to believe that America ended the Cold War on our side at the same time when Russia ended its side of the Cold War in

1991, but that the U.S. Government was actually planning instead to surround Russia by increasing NATO, right up to Russia's borders."

I suppose the truth of Zuesse's statement depends on who is the US government. Is it the President or the neoconservatives and the military/security complex?

If the government is the President as the representative of the people, *I know for a fact that President Reagan's intent was to end, not win, the cold war.*

He told us this over and over. He formed a top secret presidential committee with authority over the CIA in order to have independent opinion of the CIA's assertion that the US would lose an arms race if used to bring Russia with her broken economy to the negotiating table. Reagan's plan was that once his supply-side policy had eliminated America's stagflation, America's restored economy would bury Russia's broken and unrepairable economy in an arms race. The point of the threatened arms race was to bring Gorbachev to the negotiation table to end the Cold War, not to win an arms race.

We investigated the CIA's documents and reported to President Reagan that it was a case of the CIA protecting its budget and its power. If Reagan dismantled the Cold War, without an enemy the CIA's budget along with that of the Military Security Complex's budget would be defenseless at their high levels.

Ronald Reagan was an outsider to the Republican Establishment, represented at that time by George H. W. Bush, vice president and former director of the CIA. Reagan was seen as a challenge to the Republican Establishment's control of the Republican Party. Eight years of Reagan followed by eight years of Jack Kemp meant the end of the Republican Establishment that serves organized interests. Political parties are concerned with power and control, not with the national interest. Here was Reagan, and his few supporters in his administration, challenging the power and profit of the vested interests for the sake of world peace.

The American media, whores to the CIA, started on us. But it didn't fit. The narrative wasn't yet constructed. James Baker, the principal operative of George H. W. Bush, admitted that he promised Gorbachev no movement east of NATO. But there is no written signed document, so the story was changed by later Washington administrations.

Zuesse misses the true story, because he succumbs to ideology and is unable to understand that Reagan, like Trump, was an outsider who brought hope that the political system could be restored to the people's control.

The American media and the American leftwing made sure that this did not happen.

Consequently, we now face nuclear Armageddon. It is only a tick away unless Putin decides to surrender.

The Republicans are helpless. Their goal is to make America great again, which plays into the neoconservatives' agenda of US hegemony.

To deal with the challenges America faces requires awareness of the facts, but facts are no longer politically correct. They don't fit the narratives and, therefore, are untrue and dismissed as misinformation.

In my lifetime I have watched my country descend into degeneracy, ignorance, and evil. The nation into which I was born does not exist except as a geographical location.

*

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

Dr. Paul Craig Roberts writes on his blog site, PCR Institute for Political Economy, where [this article](#) was originally published. He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

Featured image is from Stop the War Coalition

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Dr. Paul Craig Roberts](#), Global Research, 2022

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Dr. Paul Craig Roberts](#)

About the author:

Paul Craig Roberts, former Assistant Secretary of the US Treasury and Associate Editor of the Wall Street Journal, has held numerous university appointments. He is a frequent contributor to Global Research. Dr. Roberts can be reached at <http://paulcraigroberts.org>

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