

On the Precipice of Nuclear War

Written by John Hallam

Tuesday, 24 February 2015 15:52 -

OpEdNews Op Eds 2/11/2015 at 11:26:32

On the Precipice of Nuclear War

<http://www.opednews.com/articles/On-the-Precipice-of-Nuclear-War-by-Joseph-Clifford-Nuclear-War-Nuclear-Weapons-Putin-Ukraine-150211-84.html>

By Joseph Clifford (about the author) Permalink (Page 1 of 1 pages)

Related Topic(s): Nuclear War; Nuclear Weapons; Putin; Ukraine;

Ukraine, Add Tags Add to My Group(s)

From commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Operation_Upshot-Knothole_-_Badger_001.jpg:

282px-Operation_Upshot- ...

282px-Operation_Upshot- ...

(image by commons.wikimedia.org)

Corporate media's misleading information on the Ukraine is bizarre, incomplete, not factual, and designed to bring about yet another war. It's the run-up to Iraq all over again. By their standards Putin is a monster, has invaded Kiev, and has an insatiable appetite for war. Compare the number of nations the US has bombed with that of Russia. Compared to the US they are a passive nation, which media refuses to disclose. What is truly frightening is the very distinct possibility of a nuclear confrontation between Russia and the US, a fact also completely ignored by corporate media. It is time for some relevant information on the Ukraine before the insane deciders bring us to a nuclear confrontation with Russia, which we all know no one wins.

For almost two centuries the US has insisted on enforcing the Monroe Doctrine in this hemisphere, and no major US politician would dare to suggest it is illegal or invalid. All would say it is America's right to maintain control of this hemisphere in order to protect ourselves. Why then does Russia not have the right to keep foreign powers from its borders, just as the US? The US, through its puppet NATO, has forced its way to the very doorstep of Russia, even though after the fall of the Soviet Republic, we agreed not to expand into any of the former Soviet states. We completely reneged on that promise, another unreported fact by corporate media, and encircled Russia in Eastern Europe with weapons and bases. Remember how swiftly the US risked nuclear war with Russia over the Cuban Missile Crises?? Imagine how Russia feels with the endless NATO military bases right at Russia's door. In 2008 the Russians bluntly told the US they would not tolerate further expansion into their sphere of influence, but the US completely disregarded that warning.

On the Precipice of Nuclear War

Written by John Hallam

Tuesday, 24 February 2015 15:52 -

In an attempt to capture the Ukraine, the US poured 5 billion dollars into anti Ukraine government organizations, then picked a new leader, and when the European's called for restraint, Victoria Nuland, the foul mouthed US ambassador eloquently insulted them with her infamous quote: "F---- the Europeans". A coup of a democratically elected leader of the Ukraine was orchestrated and assisted by the US, and Ms. Nuland's champion, Yatsenyuk, ("Yatz is our man") emerged from the coup as the new US puppet. Neocons who planed this, were shocked that all Ukrainians would not accept our handpicked leader of the illegal government which is backed by neo Nazis and fascists. Seems Ukrainians believed they should have a say and were reluctant to accept Ms. Nuland's man as their leader. A civil war occurred and the US bears much responsibility for it by meddling and orchestrating an overthrow of a democratically elected leader in Russia's back yard.

According to German intelligence, over 50,000 people have been killed in their civil war and now the neocon warmongers and Mr. Obama, the neocon puppet, is preparing to arm the illegal government against those who resist and want self-determination. Mr. Obama says they are facing "separatist's aggression", a phrase I assume he would apply to the "Minutemen" of New England and the "Sons of Liberty" who led the American Revolution fighting for our freedom.

Europe has finally realized decision makers in the US are quite willing to get us into a nuclear war, and have stepped back. While the US most likely will send weapons to the illegal government in the Ukraine, all other sane nations have ruled that out, a fact ignored by corporate media. Germany, France, and others have flatly said no to sending arms, and most credible experts (not politicians) have warned against arming Kiev. It remains to be seen if the US can impose its will and drag Europe into this conflict. They seemingly have realized neocons don't care about a nuclear war with Russia, and are now independently seeking a diplomatic solution, much to the disappointment of the US. We don't like diplomacy, we like war. Recall recently, how disappointed we were when those pesky Russians managed to get Assad of Syria to give up all his chemical weapons (that Russian aggression yet again) when we were prepared to bomb them into oblivion. Russia frustrated the US, who prefers bombs to diplomacy.

Former leader of the Soviet Union, Nobel Peace Prize winner, and one time media darling, Mikhail Gorbachev, recently warned in the German publication Spiegel: "A war of this kind would unavoidably lead to a nuclear war." "We won't survive the coming years if someone loses their nerve in this overheated situation." "This is not something I'm saying thoughtlessly. I am extremely concerned."

On the Precipice of Nuclear War

Written by John Hallam

Tuesday, 24 February 2015 15:52 -

Want a war with Russia? Want a nuclear war? Better do something. The inmates are running the asylum!

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/this-is-no-time-to-ship-lethal-arms-to-ukraine/5431048>

This is No Time to Ship Lethal Arms to Ukraine

By Jonathan Power

Global Research, February 13, 2015

Transnational.org

Region: Russia and FSU

Theme: US NATO War Agenda

Please put your hand up if you support giving lethal arms to the Ukrainian army and also supported the US going to war with Iraq in 2003 and with Libya in 2011, the former which unbalanced much of the Middle East and the latter which has left a country almost destroyed, semi-ruled by malicious militias.

Also raise your hand if you supported in 1998 the West going to war against Serbia in order to wrest away its province of Kosovo and give it independence- a move which ironically Russia (and Spain, worried about its Basques) opposed, arguing that this would set a precedent for territorial separation by force of arms.

If you supported all these three interventions don't take offence if I question your judgment on the issue of arms for Ukraine.

I am trying to work out where President Barack Obama stands on all this. His vice-president, Joe Biden, seems to be running with the foxes while he himself is running with the hares. Take the president's interview on CNN the weekend before last. Until then the official White House line had been that the crisis was instigated by President Vladimir Putin to block Ukraine from creating a democratic government.

On the Precipice of Nuclear War

Written by John Hallam

Tuesday, 24 February 2015 15:52 -

But in that broadcast, as my esteemed fellow columnist, William Pfaff, has observed, “Obama conceded to an American TV audience that the official US narrative concerning the war in Ukraine isn’t true”.

On CNN Obama said that “Mr. Putin made this decision around Crimea and Maidan not because of some grand strategy, but essentially because he was caught off-balance by the protest in the Maidan and Ukraine’s then-president (Viktor Yanukovich) fleeing after we (the U.S. and the European Union) had made a deal to broker power in Ukraine.”

Pfaff adds his own authoritative interpretation of the reasons for what happened next: “Believing that the Maidan demonstrations last February had been secretly contrived by the West (easy for Putin to suspect because of the presence of EU representatives, as well as an American Assistant Secretary of State and a visit to Kiev by CIA officials), Putin retaliated by adroitly seizing Crimea, for many years a Russian territory, but Ukrainian only since 1954”.

I find it easier to work out where German Chancellor Angela Merkel stands. Although she was party to the counterproductive EU attempt to pull Ukraine into the EU orbit by insisting that a new trade deal would mean that Ukraine should shun Russia’s own Eurasian Economic Community, whereas it should have been allowed to face both ways, and also party to a Western policy that still refuses to say loud and clear that Nato does not expect Ukraine ever to join NATO, she now realises the West has put itself on the slippery slope.

She is trying to persuade both sides from sliding down it. The other day, confronting those who seek tougher sanctions on Russia and sending arms to Ukraine, she urged patience: “I am surprised at how faint-hearted we are and how quickly we lose courage.” By stealing the language of the “hard” school she has pulled the carpet from beneath them. It is they who have to prove that this won’t lead to a dangerous confrontation with Russia- even war.

The Western publics will never agree to that. What? Fight over a piece of “far away country between people of whom we know little”? They will not.

This is not Chamberlain’s appeasement. What is appeasement is that the Russian government until recently accepted with barely a murmur, that the West, ignoring its own implied promises, would not expand NATO so far east.

Russian has appeased the West, not vice versa. Now, belatedly, the

On the Precipice of Nuclear War

Written by John Hallam

Tuesday, 24 February 2015 15:52 -

expansion right up to Russia's border rankles. The West's behavior in Ukraine has convinced Putin that the West would like nothing better than to push the reach of Nato up to Ukraine's border with Russia.

If Obama does let himself be swept along by hard line advisors and senators and orders the military to ship in heavy weapons the US won't have the other big Nato powers going along with it. Neither Germany nor France, nor Spain, nor Italy, nor the UK. Leaders know their electorate would not tolerate it.

I don't think Obama will. Apart from the CNN quote (above), which suggests he understands Putin's point of view, Obama certainly does not want to leave office with a proxy war with Russia raging. If he doesn't want to attack Syria or put boots on the ground to fight ISIS, if he is happy to get the US out of Afghanistan and not to seriously re-enter the Iraq imbroglio, he is not going to go up against Russia, even via the indirect proxy of the Ukrainian army.

That's how I read it. How do you?

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-illusion-of-peace-in-ukraine/5430972>

The Illusion of Peace in Ukraine. It's Three Minutes to Midnight

By Stephen Lendman

Global Research, February 13, 2015

Region: Russia and FSU

Theme: US NATO War Agenda

In-depth Report: UKRAINE REPORT

On Tuesday, Contact Group envoys representing France, Germany, Russia and Ukraine held talks ahead of Wednesday's Minsk summit attempt to resolve ongoing conflict conditions diplomatically.

Previous efforts failed. Will this time be different? Don't bet on it. More on this below."

Obama and Putin spoke. A White House statement combined the usual America supports peace rubbish with blaming Russia for US/Kiev crimes.

On the Precipice of Nuclear War

Written by John Hallam

Tuesday, 24 February 2015 15:52 -

Obama turned truth on its head saying “if Russia continues its aggressive actions in Ukraine, including by sending troops, weapons, and financing to support the separatists, the costs for Russia will rise.”

Fact: Washington wants war, not peace. Stop NATO highlighted what’s ongoing headlining “US Deploys More Warplanes (in Europe) In Expanding (its) Anti-Russian Campaign.”

Fact: Russia alone continues going all-out for resolving Ukraine’s conflict diplomatically. It’s the only country supplying large amounts of desperately needed humanitarian aid to Donbas residents.

Washington and Kiev want them isolated, slaughtered and starved to death.

Fact: Conflict continues. Rebels continue making gains. At the same time, Colonel Cassad reported “a whole number of frontline cities...subjected to a large-sale artillery shelling of a terrorist nature...to improve the front line before Minsk” talks.

Reuters said rebel advances “diminished hopes (for a Minsk) deal.” Donetsk People’s Republic (DPR) parliament Speaker Denis Pushilin said it’s too early to talk of a deal.

An unnamed Russian source said Minsk discussions will focus on creating a demilitarized zone – not a document resolving the conflict.

One rebel commander likely spoke for others saying fighting won’t stop with junta forces being battered.

“We are absolutely against” a ceasefire, he said. “They will have time to regroup. We have them now.”

Pushilin said success in Minsk “depends on (how) Contact Group (leaders) respond to our proposals.”

Lugansk negotiator Vladislav Deinego said “(w)e have handed over (to Contact Group members) a draft protocol outlining a set of measures of both political and military character aimed at a peaceful settlement of the situation.”

Military measures are “temporary,” he explained. “Achieving a stable peace is possible only through a political solution” granting Donbas political autonomy.

A previous article explained failed Moscow peace talks. On Wednesday,

On the Precipice of Nuclear War

Written by John Hallam

Tuesday, 24 February 2015 15:52 -

Hollande, Merkel and Putin continue discussions.

Illegitimate oligarch Ukraine president Poroshenko joined them. Expect no more success now than earlier.

Obama wants war, not peace. He didn't initiate proxy conflict to quit. He wants total control over Ukraine nationwide.

He wants it as a platform to target Russia. Things head perilously closer to direct confrontation.

Last November, the London-based European Leadership Network (ELN) think tank explained at least 40 NATO/Russian forces near misses.

Saying relations between both sides are characterized by "mistrust, fear, and shortened leadership decision times...(A) volatile stand-off between (nuclear powers) could prove catastrophic."

Given Washington's rage for war, fears may become reality. Things perhaps are closer to nuclear confrontation than ever before.

Washington bears full responsibility. Its rage for world dominance may cause armageddon.

The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists (BAS) "speak(s) knowledge to power." It calls today's threat "serious." Time is short to resolve things, it stresses.

Its Doomsday Clock shows three minutes to midnight. The only time it's been there since 1984. At the time, it noted US/Soviet Russia "icy nadir" relations.

"Every channel of communications (was) constricted or shut down; every form of contact has been attenuated or cut off. And arms control negotiations (were) reduced to a species of propaganda."

In late January, BAS headlined "2015: IT IS 3 MINUTES TO MIDNIGHT," saying:

"Unchecked climate change, global nuclear weapons modernizations, and outsized nuclear weapons arsenals pose extraordinary and undeniable threats to the continued existence of humanity, and world leaders have failed to act with the speed or on the scale required to protect citizens from potential catastrophe."

"These failures of political leadership endanger every person on Earth."

On the Precipice of Nuclear War

Written by John Hallam

Tuesday, 24 February 2015 15:52 -

“(T)he United and Russia have embarked on massive programs to modernize their nuclear triads – thereby undermining existing nuclear weapons treaties.”

“The clock ticks now at just three minutes to midnight because international leaders are failing to perform their most important duty – ensuring and preserving the health and vitality of human civilization.”

Some historical perspective: In 1947, BAS began Doomsday Clock readings. At the time, it stood at 7 minutes to midnight.

In 1949, it plunged to 3 minutes to midnight after Soviet Russia tested its first nuclear device – “officially starting an arms race.”

In 1953, it was at 2 minutes to midnight after America tested its first thermonuclear (H-bomb) device. Nine months later, Soviet Russia tested its own.

In 1960, the Clock stood at 7 minutes to midnight. “For the first time, (US and Soviet Russian officials) appear(ed) eager to avoid direct confrontation,” said BAS.

In 1963, it was at 12 minutes to midnight after both sides signed the Partial Test Ban Treaty. All atmospheric testing ended.

In 1968, it was 7 minutes to midnight because of America’s escalating Vietnam War. Other disturbing issues included France and China developing nuclear weapons.

At the time, BAS said:

“There is little reason to feel sanguine about the future of our society on the world scale.”

“There is a mass revulsion against war, yes; but no sign of conscious intellectual leadership in a rebellion against the deadly heritage of international anarchy.”

In 1969, the Clock stood at 10 minutes to midnight after nearly all nations agreed to Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) provisions.

Israel, India and Pakistan notably remain nuclear outlaws. Washington most of all despite being an NPT signatory.

In 1972, the clock was at 12 minutes to midnight after America and

On the Precipice of Nuclear War

Written by John Hallam

Tuesday, 24 February 2015 15:52 -

Russia signed the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT) and Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM).

Washington never observed SALT provisions. In December 2001, Bush abandoned ABM, renounced NPT, and asserted the right to develop and test new nuclear weapons.

He refused to adopt proposed Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty (FMCT) provisions, prohibiting further weapons-grade uranium and plutonium production.

He rescinded the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention (BWC), prohibiting development of new biowarfare weapons.

He renounced the 1989 US Biological Weapons Anti-Terrorism Act prohibiting “the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons.”

Obama continues potentially humanity destroying Bush policies. He escalated them by proxy war in Ukraine. Goaded Russia into possible catastrophic conflict. More on this below.

In 1974, BAS' Doomsday Clock stood at 9 minutes to midnight after India tested its first nuclear device.

In 1980, it was at 7 minutes to midnight 35 years after the start of the nuclear age. At the time, BAS said:

Soviet Russia and America “behav(e) like what may best be described as ‘nucleoholics’ – drunks who continue to insist that the drink being consumed is positively ‘the last one,’ but who can always find a good excuse for ‘just one more round.’ ”

In 1981, the Clock was at 4 minutes to midnight after Soviet Russia's Afghanistan invasion hardened America's nuclear posture.

In 1984, it registered 3 minutes to midnight after dialogue between the world's superpowers “virtually stop(ped).”

“The United States seems to flout the few arms control agreements in place by seeking an expansive, space-based anti-ballistic missile capability, raising worries that a new arms race will begin,” said BAS.

In 1988, the Clock was at 6 minutes to midnight after America and Russia signed the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty.

On the Precipice of Nuclear War

Written by John Hallam

Tuesday, 24 February 2015 15:52 -

In 1990, it registered 10 minutes to midnight in the wake of the Berlin Wall's fall.

In 1991, it was at 17 minutes to midnight after America and Russia began nuclear arsenal reductions.

"The illusion that tens of thousands of nuclear weapons are a guarantor of national security (was) stripped away," said BAS.

In 1995, the Clock registered 14 minutes to midnight after hopes for renouncing nuclear weapons faded.

Especially because US "hard-liners (don't) soften their rhetoric or actions (then or now)...(T)hey claim that a resurgent Russia could provide as much of a threat as the Soviet Union," said BAS.

In 1998, the Clock stood at 9 minutes to midnight after India and Pakistan held nuclear weapons tests three weeks apart.

In 2002, it dropped to 7 minutes to midnight after Washington expressed intent to develop and produce more destructive nuclear weapons.

In 2007, it was at 5 minutes to midnight with America and Russia "ready to stage a nuclear attack within minutes," said BAS.

In 2010, it was at 6 minutes to midnight during US/Russian Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty follow-up talks.

In 2012, it registered 5 minutes to midnight. "(I)t is difficult to see where the capacity lies to address(ing)" the challenge of "ridding the world of nuclear weapons," said BAS.

It's now "3 MINUTES TO MIDNIGHT." Potentially things head disastrously toward a dangerous all-time low.

Neocons infesting Washington deplore peace. They want endless wars. They want all independent countries eliminated.

They want planet earth colonized. All nations made subservient to US interests. US-dominated NATO used as a global police force.

Wars on humanity without end to exert and maintain control. Lunatics in charge risk potential life-ending nuclear war with Russia.

On the Precipice of Nuclear War

Written by John Hallam

Tuesday, 24 February 2015 15:52 -

BAS warnings go unheeded. Obama heads recklessly toward what no responsible leader would dare. The unthinkable may become reality.

Stephen Lendman lives in Chicago. He can be reached at lendmanstephen@sbcglobal.net. His new book as editor and contributor is titled "Flashpoint in Ukraine: US Drive for Hegemony Risks WW III." <http://www.claritypress.com/LendmanIII.html> Visit his blog site at sjlendman.blogspot.com. Listen to cutting-edge discussions with distinguished guests on the Progressive Radio News Hour on the Progressive Radio Network. It airs three times weekly: live on Sundays at 1PM Central time plus two prerecorded archived programs.

<http://www.examiner.com/article/world-war-3-prepping-russia-conducts-nuclear-sub-drills-under-north-pole>

World War 3 prepping: Russia conducts nuclear sub drills under North Pole

February 11, 2015 10:34 PM MST

As ice thaws, nations and militaries have their eye on the Arctic in hopes they can lay claim to its resources.
on.aol.com

Russia is not only stepping up its military presence in Ukraine, the superpower just conducted naval exercises with its nuclear submarines under the North Pole. If not prepping for World War 3, which is what many fear, what could possibly be the point? But instead of preparing for a third world war, Russian authorities say the maneuvers were conducted to reinforce its position with regard to the Arctic, now highly prized in that many resource experts believe the region holds an immense wealth of oil and gas deposits.

Business Insider reported (via Yahoo News) Feb. 9 that Russian nuclear units conducted exercises in the international waters under the North Pole over the weekend leading into February. And although they may have been conducted without the world's knowledge, Russian officials had no problem announcing what their naval forces had been up to under the northernmost ice cap once the exercises were complete.

On the Precipice of Nuclear War

Written by John Hallam

Tuesday, 24 February 2015 15:52 -

Western authorities believe the maneuvers were a response to NATO's reinforcement of its forces along Russia's borders in eastern Europe. But Russian military officials say otherwise.

"In particular we focused on hazard and threat detection, but also on missile launching and navigation manoeuvres, ice reconnaissance, submerging and emerging from ice, using torpedoes to undermine ice and many other issues," Vadim Serga, captain of Russia's North Fleet, was quoted in a translation provided by Newsweek.

But while some are worried about mounting tensions and moves that could very well provide the ramp-up to World War 3, Russia's claims to the Arctic are positionings that speak toward a long-term approach. The economically stagnant nation has become increasingly contentious about the Arctic, making its claims along with several other nations to the Arctic sea bed. Geological experts in the U. S. estimates that upwards of 15 percent of the earth's remaining oil, 30 percent of its natural gas, and 20 percent of its liquefied natural gas are stored in reservoirs beneath the sea floor in the Arctic.

Russia is also funding major construction across the Arctic region, including ten Arctic search-and-rescue stations, 16 deepwater ports, 13 airfields, and ten air-defense radar stations along the extensive nation's Arctic coast. Russia also plans to construct a military reconnaissance drone base only 420 miles away from Alaska, having already begun construction of an Arctic military base of operations 30 miles away from Finland's border.

News of the Russian nuclear submarine exercises come just days after British Typhoon fighters were scrambled to escort two long-range Russian bombers flying without their transponders on came alarmingly close to U. K. airspace. According to BBC News, the British Foreign Office admitted that the bombers never actually entered U. K. airspace, they represented "part of an increasing pattern of out-of-area operations" by Russia.

The European Leadership Network, a London-based think tank, released a report in November where it revealed that NATO had admitted that its fighters had recorded over 100 intercepts and encounters with Russian military aircraft as of October 2014, which reflected a three-fold increase over 2013. The report concluded that such an escalation in encounters increased the potential for confrontations that could easily spiral out of control, leading to possible military conflict.