

You're Not Supporting Ukraine Enough Until the Nuclear Blast Hits Your Face

By [Prof. Max Abrahms](#)

Global Research, September 18, 2023

[Newsweek](#) 14 September 2023

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

Theme: [Intelligence](#)

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.

What happened to [Elon Musk](#) this past week showcases how completely unhinged and dangerous U.S. policy to Ukraine has become. The condemnation began when the Washington Post published excerpts from a new biography on Musk revealing that he turned down a Ukrainian request to help launch a major sneak attack in September 2022 on the Crimean port of Sevastopol.

There were [numerous](#), [legitimate reasons](#) why Musk refused to activate his Starlink internet services for Ukraine to carry out the unprecedented, surprise attack on Russian naval vessels: Musk was providing terminals to Ukraine for free; he was not on a military contract at that time; the late-night request came directly from the Ukrainian—not American—government; and Starlink had never been activated over Crimea because of U.S. sanctions on Russia.

Most importantly, Musk was concerned that enabling the attack could result in serious "[conflict escalation](#)." He worried that he was being asked to turn on Starlink for a "[Pearl Harbor like attack](#)" and had no wish to "[proactively take part in a major act of war](#)," possibly provoking a Russian [nuclear response](#).

In [response](#) to this nuclear aversion, Musk was called "evil" by a high-level Ukrainian official and "traitor" by American war enthusiasts.

[Rachel Maddow](#) on the Russia conspiracy network [MSNBC](#) said Musk was "intervening to try to stop Ukraine from winning the war." Not to be outdone, [CNN](#)'s Jake Tapper described Elon as a "capricious billionaire" who "sabotaged a military operation by Ukraine, a U.S. ally," an act that demands "repercussions." For his part, chief Iraq war salesman-turned-Democrat-darling, David Frum, said that Musk must be stripped of his U.S. government contracts for not reflexively acceding to the Ukrainian Starlink request, and former "progressive,"

Sen. [Elizabeth Warren](#), called for an [immediate Congressional investigation](#) “to ensure foreign policy is conducted by the government and not by one billionaire.”

!! [@SenWarren](#) demands an investigation into SpaceX after Musk blocked Ukraine from extending the Starlink network near Crimea.

“The Congress needs to investigate whether we have adequate tools to ensure foreign policy is conducted by the government and not by one billionaire”.
pic.twitter.com/p3I19Yk851

— Ostap Yarysh (@OstapYarysh) [September 12, 2023](#)

But the Musk pile-on was just getting started.

In the days that followed, his detractors used a Ukrainian operation as proof that Musk was overreacting.

Days after the Starlink story broke, Ukraine successfully launched British Storm Shadow cruise missiles into the Russian naval headquarters in the Crimean port city of Sevastopol. It was the [largest attack](#) since Moscow launched its full-scale invasion of Ukraine nearly 19 months ago, and it [damaged](#) a Russian submarine and warship.

When the military action was not followed by World War III, Musk was torched again.

As the pro-war media [noted](#), “It was precisely such a strike, according to Musk, that should have provoked a nuclear war.”

A [torrent](#) of [international relations pundits](#) on [Twitter](#) mocked Musk, tweeting things like “I was assured by an internet service provider executive that this would have caused WWII and the use of nuclear weapons” and “How’s it going man, after the splendid attack on Sevastopol? WW3 started already?”

Musk’s detractors might think this is all very funny, but attacking Crimea—not to mention the Russian mainland in increasingly frequent drone strikes on Moscow—is no laughing matter. Even the staunchest Western war enthusiasts from the NATO-aligned [Atlantic Council](#) to the Estonian [defense minister](#) to Biden’s own Secretary of State [Antony Blinken](#) all previously acknowledged that threatening Crimea is a possible “red line” that could lead to nuclear war.

As the [Russian military](#) specialist Nicolò Fasola [pointed out](#) in April, “There’s a definite risk that Putin would use nuclear weapons to counter a Ukrainian offensive in Crimea. And that’s why Ukraine’s Western allies are reluctant.”

But that previous caution has faded—no doubt as a result of the much-touted counteroffensive [disappointing American war planners](#), leading to a seemingly endless and halting war of attrition [reminiscent of World War I](#). Meanwhile, Biden’s [political legacy is on the line](#) as the presidential election looms.

The longer the war goes on, the more the Biden administration and its [NATO](#) allies are throwing caution to the wind. Biden [keeps consenting](#) to supply weapons previously ruled

out as [excessively escalatory](#), from Patriot air defense systems to Abrams tanks to cluster munitions to F-16's. The latest reversal is over the expected transfer of Army Tactical Missile Systems that can fly up to 190 miles, [enabling Ukrainian forces](#) to strike far beyond Russia's defensive positions inside Crimea and deep into Russian sovereign territory.

National Security advisor [Jake Sullivan](#) used to [rule out](#) ATACMS "to ensure that we don't get into a situation in which we are approaching the Third World War." Even CNN, an enthusiastic advocate for greater American involvement in the war, has [acknowledged](#) the "fears about escalating the conflict."

A couple months ago, Senator James Risch of Idaho [told](#) the Aspen Security Forum, "I'm tired of hearing about escalation. I want Putin to wake up in the morning worried about what he's going to do that's going to cause us to escalate." Biden apparently now agrees.

The view now ruling the [Democratic Party](#) and the President is the same as the warmongers:

It's silly to worry as Musk does about turning the Ukraine war into something catastrophically worse.

It's un-American not to try to find Russia's redline for starting World War III.

It's traitorous to believe—as the President himself did, just a few months ago—that we should be doing all we can to prevent escalation.

The new mantra seems to be:

We're not trying hard enough in Ukraine until we feel the nuclear blast against our faces.

*


Our thanks to Newsweek for having brought this important article to our attention.

Copyright Prof. Max Abrahms, Newsweek, September 2023.

[To access the complete article on Newsweek click here](#)

Max Abrahms, Ph.D., is a professor of political science at Northeastern University and author of Rules for Rebels: The Science of Victory in Militant History.

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.



[“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 [Newsweek](#)

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Prof. Max Abrahms](#)

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