

Dangerous Crossroads: US-NATO Should Engage in Nuclear Blackmail Against Russia? Former US Nuclear Defense Advisor

By [Lucas Leiroz de Almeida](#)

Global Research, October 08, 2023

Region: [Russia and FSU](#)

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 button below the author's name.

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.

NATO is increasingly explicit in its anti-Russian war plans. In an [article](#) recently published on the Atlantic alliance website, an ex-senior US official called for a nuclear war against the Russian Federation. These moves make clear the real intentions of the Western bloc against Moscow and show how NATO is not interested in any alternative to find a peaceful solution to current tensions.

[Gregory Weaver](#), former nuclear defense advisor to the US Joint Staff, states in the article that **Russia poses a nuclear "challenge" to the US**. He believes that Moscow could violate its own nuclear doctrine and use atomic bombs on the battlefield in conventional conflicts, such as the Ukrainian one, or directly attack NATO countries if the US were involved in a war against another nuclear power, such as China.

Weaver sees Russian leadership as extremely irresponsible, with "propensity to take risk, and to miscalculate profoundly in the process of doing so." In this sense, the former advisor believes that Moscow could take nuclear measures against NATO without calculating the consequences of this action, or believing that Washington would simply not respond, avoiding a global nuclear escalation.

So, instead of suggesting peaceful solutions to this scenario and calling for a reduction of tensions to avoid nuclear risks, Weaver embraces the opposite direction: **he calls on NATO to engage in a process of nuclear deterrence against Russia**. For the author, the alliance must increase its offensive potential, prepare fighters and submarines to launch tactical nuclear weapons and, if "necessary", start a limited direct nuclear war with Russia. In this scenario, both sides would use tactical nuclear weapons in a "moderate" way, without escalating the conflict globally.

“To enable that strategy, NATO nuclear and conventional forces must be capable of:

1- providing a robust range of response options to restore deterrence by convincing Russian leadership they have direly miscalculated, that further nuclear use will not achieve their objectives, and that they will incur costs that far exceed any benefits they can achieve;

2- countering the military impact of Russian theater nuclear use;

3- continuing to operate effectively to achieve US and Allied objectives in a limited nuclear use environment. To meet these requirements NATO needs a range of continuously forward deployed, survivable theater nuclear capabilities that can reliably penetrate adversary theater air and missile defenses with a range of explosive yields on operationally relevant timelines,” the article reads.

Conveniently, Weaver did not mention in his article the possible consequences of a conflict of this type for the European continent, where such a war would certainly be fought. This clearly shows how Europe has no relevant value for American geopolitical plans, being just a theater of operations against Russia. If it is necessary to destroy European countries with nuclear bombs to achieve its “strategic goals”, the US would certainly do so, as for them the Europeans are not allies, but true vassals and proxies.

In fact, Weaver’s article is a clear example of the warmongering mentality that has achieved hegemonic status among US political and economic elites. The obsession with preserving the declining unipolar order and defeating Russia and China is leading Washington decision-makers to consider such insanities as the deliberate creation of a direct conflict between the world’s two largest nuclear powers.

There is in the US an unfounded belief in the possibility of creating a “[limited nuclear theater](#)”, where attacks would take place in a moderate manner without escalating into a global risk situation. But this is not a likely scenario. The only possibility for a regional nuclear theater not to escalate into a global one is if the attacks are unilateral, with no response from the affected side. From the moment there is an exchange of attacks, the tendency is that at some point one of the sides decides to attack the decision-making centers in the enemy capital with strategic nuclear weapons - which could lead to disastrous global consequences.

Furthermore, it is necessary to emphasize how Weaver is using fallacious rhetoric in his favor to justify the war. At no point was there any “miscalculation” on Russia’s part. Moscow launched its special military operation very carefully, taking all necessary measures to protect its people and avoid escalations. But there were real threats from Western public figures, such as former British **Prime Minister [Liz Truss](#)**, who stated that she was “ready” to promote “global annihilation.”

Until now, the Western side has been the only one to make irrational, miscalculated and irresponsible decisions. The nuclear blackmail started with the West and the Russians only responded. As Russian authorities have made clear several times, the use of nuclear weapons would only occur in cases determined by the country’s doctrine - which, unlike the American one, is strictly defensive.


*

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 [InfoBrics](#).

Lucas Leiroz is a journalist, researcher at the Center for Geostrategic Studies, geopolitical consultant. You can follow Lucas on [Twitter](#) and [Telegram](#).

Featured image is from [Strategic Culture Foundation](#)



[“Towards a World War III Scenario: The Dangers of Nuclear War”](#)

by Michel Chossudovsky

Available to order from Global Research!

ISBN Number: 978-0-9737147-5-3

Year: 2012

Pages: 102

PDF Edition: \$6.50 (sent directly to your email account!)

[Michel Chossudovsky](#) is Professor of Economics at the University of Ottawa and Director of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG), which hosts the critically acclaimed website www.globalresearch.ca. He is a contributor to the Encyclopedia Britannica. His writings have been translated into more than 20 languages.

Reviews

“This book is a ‘must’ resource – a richly documented and systematic diagnosis of the supremely pathological geo-strategic planning of US wars since ‘9-11’ against non-nuclear countries to seize their oil fields and resources under cover of ‘freedom and democracy’.”

-John McMurtry, Professor of Philosophy, Guelph University

“In a world where engineered, pre-emptive, or more fashionably “humanitarian” wars of aggression have become the norm, this challenging book may be our final wake-up call.”

-Denis Halliday, Former Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations

Michel Chossudovsky exposes the insanity of our privatized war machine. Iran is being targeted with nuclear weapons as part of a war agenda built on distortions and lies for the purpose of private profit. The real aims are oil, financial hegemony and global control. The price could be nuclear holocaust. When weapons become the hottest export of the world's only superpower, and diplomats work as salesmen for the defense industry, the whole world is recklessly endangered. If we must have a military, it belongs entirely in the public sector. No one should profit from mass death and destruction.

-Ellen Brown, author of 'Web of Debt' and president of the Public Banking Institute

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Lucas Leiroz de Almeida](#), Global Research, 2023

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Lucas Leiroz de Almeida](#)

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