

Zelensky's Demand for the West to Nuke Russia Was Irresponsible but Not Credible

By [Andrew Korybko](#)

Global Research, October 07, 2022

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

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [Military](#), [Military and WMD](#)

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

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the **Translate This Article** button below the author's name.

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.

Some interpreted the Ukrainian leader's statement as implying some desire on behalf of his American patron, seeing as how he functions as its proxy. That's an inaccurate reading of what just happened, however.

Russian presidential spokesman Peskov [slammed](#) Zelensky on Thursday after the Ukrainian leader told Australia's [Lowy Institute](#) that the West should launch a so-called "preemptive strike" against that [newly restored world power](#) in order to deter it from using nuclear weapons. The Kremlin's stance is that this amounts to an irresponsible demand for World War III, though Zelensky's press secretary later walked back his boss' remarks by [claiming](#) that he was supposedly referring to "preemptive sanctions" only.

Some interpreted the Ukrainian leader's statement as implying some desire on behalf of his American patron, seeing as how he functions as its proxy. That's an inaccurate reading of what just happened, however, since it ignores his press secretary walking back the remark in question. Furthermore, the US could convey its nuclear first-strike intentions through established military, intelligence, and/or diplomatic channels instead of resorting to that former actor doing so while talking to a think tank.

On the topic of Zelensky's past, it's actually pretty relevant to understanding what most likely just happened. As an actor, some might be inclined to think that he was indeed just reading lines that his American patron passed along to him, but another way of looking at this is that he decided to improvise exactly as those in his profession are known to do. In this case, he probably thought that Kiev's interests would be best served by making a dramatic demand, or he might have got carried away in the moment.

In any case, there are logical reasons other than the previously mentioned for why he

almost certainly was acting in a personal capacity unrepresentative of his American patrons. After all, using the Ukrainian leader to publicly convey this supposed intent on behalf of the US during his address to a think tank is much more obtuse than simply relying on the earlier described established channels. The only purpose it could presumably have is to manipulate the public's perceptions, but that motive is meaningless.

To explain, the only potential impact it could have had is to provoke large-scale protests in the West against the [Golden Billion's US-led NATO proxy war on Russia through Ukraine](#), though no such developments transpired. In fact, the public didn't even hear about what he said for the most part unless they consume censored Russian media or came across Ukrainian officials' so-called "clarification" of his remarks on social media. Generally speaking, they didn't even seem to care, which was expected.

Observers should also ask themselves why the US would want to inform the public of a nuclear first strike against Russia anyhow since all that it could possibly do is prompt protests and possibly even panic about the apocalypse. With all due respect to those readers who might have considered this indirect public messaging theory to be credible, it doesn't make any sense from the perspective of America's soft power and strategic interests, hence why that interpretation should be discounted.

There also isn't any credibility to Zelensky's irresponsible demand either. He not only isn't in a position to influence America's decision-making in this respect, but also wouldn't be informed if such a decision was made in order to maintain operational security considering the extremely high likelihood that the presidential administration is bugged and/or infiltrated by Russian spies (irrespective of these two tactics' ultimate effectiveness or lack thereof this far).

The New York Times also just cited unnamed US intelligence officials in their [report](#) about their conclusion that Kiev assassinated [Darya Dugina](#) to claim that there exist "competing power centers within the Ukrainian government" between his administration, military, and security services. This reinforces the argument that Zelensky wouldn't be informed of the US' first strike plans against Russia, let alone ordered to indirectly convey them to the public while talking to an Australian think tank.

There's also the "inconvenient" fact to consider of Biden [fearmongering](#) about Russia supposedly being the first to use nukes in the [Ukrainian Conflict](#) and thus allegedly risking World War III on the same day that Zelensky shared his irresponsible remark. If the US truly intended for its Ukrainian proxy to initiate a shift in the official narrative from warning about Russia using nukes first to preconditioning the public for the first strike that America might be planning, then it follows that Biden would have built upon this.

Instead, the American leader clung to the narrative that's circulated for the past few weeks, which is inaccurate in any sense since Russia would [only employ](#) tactical nukes **in self-defense as an absolute last resort** and not against NATO unless it was attacked first. Regarding the second scenario, this Eurasian Great Power's global leadership of hypersonic technology means that its rival's so-called "missile defense shield" has been neutralized, which ensures the integrity of Russia's second-strike capabilities.

Considering these military-strategic dynamics, the US couldn't get away scot-free with a first-strike against Russia anyhow, thus drastically decreasing the likelihood that it would ever consider this. Remembering that Zelensky's staff walked back his irresponsible remark

shortly after he made it, one can safely assume that their American patron ordered them to do so in order to dispel any misperceptions that he was speaking on behalf of the US, which could prompt Russia to overreact.

The reality is therefore the opposite of what some in the public have imagined it to be. Far from functioning as an American proxy when he made his demand, Zelensky was acting in his own personal capacity, either by reading prepared remarks that he wrongly expected to advance his side's larger interests or improvising on the spot like all actors do after getting carried away playing his role. The bottom line is that while his nuclear first strike demand was irresponsible, it wasn't credible at all.

*

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.

This article was originally published on [OneWorld](#).

Andrew Korybko is an American Moscow-based political analyst specializing in the relationship between the US strategy in Afro-Eurasia, China's One Belt One Road global vision of New Silk Road connectivity, and Hybrid Warfare. He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

Featured image is from OneWorld

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

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Andrew Korybko](#)

About the author:

Andrew Korybko is an American Moscow-based political analyst specializing in the relationship between the US strategy in Afro-Eurasia, China's One Belt One Road global vision of New Silk Road connectivity, and Hybrid Warfare. He is a frequent contributor to Global Research.

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