FORVM GEOPOLITICA
Independent Commentary on a Fractured World

Putin checkmates NATO – reason to be hopeful?

With a brilliant and completely unexpected move, Putin is dealing the West the card that no one wants to hold. A nuclear war would have to be started by the West. Chronology and analysis.

Peter Hanseler / René Zittlau

Sun 24 Nov 2024

Introduction

When President Biden authorized the use of long-range weapons a few days ago, the West imagined itself in the "comfortable" situation that President Putin could now only respond with a nuclear strike and would thus have to play the card that no one wants to hold.

Far from it: the Russians conjure a new non-nuclear weapon out of thin air, and with this move they remove the basis of the Western strategy. The West is perplexed and still does not seem to have understood the implications. The Western "leading media" are overwhelmed and speak of nuclear war threats from Moscow. In doing so, they prove that they are intellectually overwhelmed. When propaganda no longer works. We analyze chronologically.

1987 – INF Treaty

Statement of the problem

In the 1980s, then Presidents Reagan and Gorbachev concluded that nuclear and conventional ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, and rocket launchers with ranges of up to 3,420 miles (5,500 km) posed too great a danger because the parties would have too little time to communicate and neutralize the threat of Armageddon in the event of a (mistaken) launch of such weapons.

1987 - Agreement

On December 8, 1987, the INF Treaty (Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty) was signed. This agreement banned all nuclear and conventional ballistic and cruise missiles and missile launchers of the two nations with a range of 500 to 1,000 kilometers (310–620 miles) (short medium range) and 1,000 to 5,500 kilometers (620–3,420 miles) (medium range). The treaty did not apply to air- or sea-based missiles. By May 1991, the nations had destroyed 2,692 missiles, followed by ten years of on-site verification inspections.

2019 - Unilateral withdrawal by President Trump

In 2019, President Trump unilaterally suspended this agreement. The Americans claimed that the Russians had violated the treaty, without, however, being able to prove this in any way. The real reason was probably that the US wanted a free hand in the Pacific against China, which was not a party to the treaty, and that the military-industrial complex sensed a huge business opportunity, apparently based on the assumption that they would beat the Russians in this newly proclaimed arms race.

Geopolitically, this unilateral termination by the United States was yet another example of the US abiding by agreements only as long as it sees an advantage in doing so. We explored this topic in depth last week in "Loyalty – the mortar of life and geopolitics".

September 12, 2024 – Putin warns the West against using long-range missiles against Russia

On September 12, President Putin did not see the permission of the US and Great Britain to use Western long-range weapons against Russia as permission, but as a clear and direct entry of NATO countries into a war against Russia.

His exact words were:

> *If this decision is taken, it will mean nothing other than the direct involvement of NATO countries, the United States and European countries in the war in Ukraine. This is their direct involvement, and this, of course, significantly changes the essence, the nature of the conflict. It means that the NATO countries, the United States and the European countries are at war with Russia. And if that is the case, then given the changed nature of this conflict, we will make appropriate decisions based on the threats that will arise for us.*

We reported on this in "Russia wins – Europe loses – US lets Europe down".

November 18, 2024 – Biden authorizes the use of long-range weapons

Donald Trump had already made it clear during the election campaign that he intended to do everything he could to end the war in Ukraine – in stark contrast to the Biden administration, which wanted to intensify the war.

We discussed in "US Elections Decide on War or Peace" back in September that the deep state supports Harris and pursues a geostrategy of eternal war. The war in Ukraine is just one of them and a huge business for a select few.

Trump won the election and will return to the White House on January 20. The Biden administration will do everything it can to escalate the war by January to prevent Trump from achieving peace with Russia.

It is therefore consistent with this logic that President Biden gave permission on November 18 to use long-range weapons against Russia.

Obviously, Biden did not take President Putin's clear warning in September seriously.

November 19-20 – the US and the UK deploy long-range missiles in Russia

(President) Selenski did not let a day go by. On November 19, with the help of the US, he attacked targets in Bryansk with ATACMS. Most of the missiles were intercepted by the Russians, but damage was still done and there were victims.

The next day, the Ukrainians, with the help of the British and using American satellite data, attacked the Kursk region with Storm Shadow missiles – again with limited success, with the majority of the Storm Shadows being intercepted.

November 19 – Russia's new nuclear doctrine

On November 19, Russia enacted the new nuclear doctrine.

The new Russian nuclear doctrine, which is of course interpreted in the West as a threat by Moscow of a nuclear strike, is to be read differently. The historical background must be taken into account:

Firstly, the only country to have ever used nuclear weapons is the United States.

Contrary to Russian doctrine, the US did not bomb Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 because the existence of the United States was at risk, nor was victory over Japan in jeopardy. The US used this weapon solely to show the rest of the world who the new master is, a marketing campaign that cost 200,000 people their lives; I refer to my article "Bloodbaths change the world – part 1" from October 22, 2023.

Russia's nuclear doctrine was and is based on deterrence, to be used in response to a nuclear strike or in the event that Russia's existence is at stake. This principle has not changed.

The most important changes can be found in Articles 10 and 11:

> *10. The aggression of a state of a military coalition (bloc, alliance) against the Russian Federation and (or) its allies will be regarded as an aggression of this coalition (bloc, alliance) in its entirety.*
> *11. An act of aggression against the Russian Federation and/or its allies by a non-nuclear-weapon state with the participation or support of a nuclear-weapon state will be regarded as a joint attack.*

The following is important for the chronological sequence: these articles not only clarify the nuclear doctrine, but also the general military doctrine of the Russian Federation, by holding a collective – such as NATO – responsible if a member of it – such as Great Britain – attacks Russia, which has already happened with the Storm Shadow attack and gives Russia a free hand to choose any target in the entire alliance.

Thus, the change in nuclear doctrine also affects conventional doctrine.

November 21 - Test firing of a new weapon at the weapons complex in Dnipropetrovsk

On November 21, Russia attacked the Ukrainian defense complex YushMash with a new non-nuclear weapon called Oreshnik (hazelnut).

A weapon of horror called hazelnut

Oreshnik has a range that allows it to reach any point in Western Europe at a speed of Mach 10 (2.5 km per second) and has a conventional or nuclear multiple warhead. The problem for the West is that it has no defense systems against this weapon. Oreshnik would have been banned under the INF Treaty.

November 21 – Putin's speech

Putin's speech is short and worth reading.

Two statements are probably the most important: firstly, President Putin emphasizes that the use of Western long-range weapons will not affect the outcome of the war in any way.

> *"I wish to underscore once again that the use by the enemy of such weapons cannot affect the course of combat operations in the special military operation zone. Our forces are making successful advances along the entire line of contact, and all objectives we have set will be accomplished."*

Further:

> *"To reiterate, we are conducting combat tests of the Oreshnik missile system in response to NATO's aggressive actions against Russia. Our decision on further deployment of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles will depend on the actions of the United States and its satellites. We will determine the targets during further tests of our advanced missile systems based on the threats to the security of the Russian*

Federation. We consider ourselves entitled to use our weapons against military facilities of those countries that allow to use their weapons against our facilities, and in case of an escalation of aggressive actions, we will respond decisively and in mirror-like manner. I recommend that the ruling elites of the countries that are hatching plans to use their military contingents against Russia seriously consider this."

President Putin also said the following about the continued use of Oreshnik:

"It goes without saying that when choosing, if necessary and as a retaliatory measure, targets to be hit by systems such as Oreshnik on Ukrainian territory, we will in advance suggest that civilians and citizens of friendly countries residing in those areas leave danger zones. We will do so for humanitarian reasons, openly and publicly, without fear of counter-moves coming from the enemy, who will also be receiving this information."

Since November 21 – no use of long-range missiles by the West

Since November 21, the Americans and the British have refrained from further use of their long-range weapons.

Analysis

An unexpected new escalation

The West was certain that Putin could only respond with nuclear weapons to the use of long-range weapons against Russia. This calculation did not work out. With the blow against Dnepropetrovsk, Russia presented a new weapon against which the West has no countermeasure.

Oreshnik a horror for the West

ATACMS fly at speeds of up to Mach 3 and have a warhead. Most of these missiles were intercepted by the Russians during their attack. The Storm Shadow is a cruise missile that flies at just under Mach 1 and therefore does not pose a major challenge for the Russian defense.

Oreshnik, on the other hand, flies at a speed of Mach 10, making this weapon untouchable. Western defense systems are effective against targets up to a speed of Mach 3. According to initial estimates, Oreshnik has six warheads, each of which has three sub-heads. These 18 warheads can be programmed to different targets and are individually maneuverable. Due to the kinetic energy resulting from the speed of Mach 10, the effect of this weapon is difficult to imagine and comes close to the destructive power of a tactical nuclear weapon.

Putin turns the tables

In addition to the astonishing effect of the new weapons system, the following circumstance comes into play: with this move, Putin has practically put the West in checkmate.

He is forcing the alliance into a position that was unimaginable for them until November 21. The Kremlin will respond with attacks on the territory of the responsible nation if necessary in response to any further use of long-range weapons against Russia by the US or one of the NATO members. The West must assume this, since President Putin unequivocally held this out as a real prospect.

Thus, within hours, the Western alliance's initial position has undergone a complete 180-degree turn. The West – in the event that it actually wants to escalate – is in an aporetic situation, that is, a situation with no way out that would be acceptable in any form. What would be left for the West? A nuclear first strike to turn the military situation in Ukraine is in no way conveyable: not militarily, not morally, not politically. Because whoever carries out the nuclear first strike is responsible for the end of the world.

No further warnings from the Kremlin

President Putin's statements, coupled with the new Oreshnik weapon system, which Russia has already impressively demonstrated on the battlefield, are unequivocal in their clarity and determination.

We assume that Russia will attack targets outside Ukraine – without further warning – if the West – the UK, the US or Germany – uses long-range weapons against Russia.

Possible targets

Oreshnik can reach any target within a radius of up to 6,000 km, thus any location in Europe, the Middle East and North Africa.

If Storm Shadow missiles are used, targets in the UK, including the factories where the Storm Shadow is manufactured – these are located north of London – are a likely choice. It is also possible that military installations in the UK will be selected.

If Taurus is used, the MBDA headquarters in Schrobenhausen near Munich would be a likely target.

If the Americans use their ATACMS, a large number of military installations in Europe and the Middle East would be possible targets.

Remaining options for the Western alliance

Western media

The reaction of Western media shows a mixed picture. The media in Germany and Switzerland, for example, are still riding the wave of the apocalypse and claiming that Russia is threatening a nuclear war. With this absurdity, they prove that they are intellectually incapable of grasping the current situation.

The British media, of all people, seem to have grasped the changed situation and the threat it poses to the West. At least, this is suggested by some voices in the press calling on the British government to take President Putin's statements seriously.

Remaining military options for the West

In our view, the West has practically exhausted all conventional options in its fight against Russia. In theory, NATO could use American JASSMs and Tomahawks or, in an extreme case, mobilize troops in Europe. However, that is as much as it will get, and it will not have any noticeable impact on the war in Ukraine.

The only escalation that could be taken seriously would be a nuclear one, although the US is the only nation that could even get its nuclear weapons to Russia. However, we are convinced that this will not happen, as it would mean the end of human civilization – at least as we know it.

Everything depends on the US

The Biden administration is incapable of escalation – it is the deep state

You don't have to be a medically trained person to realize that President Biden is in no condition to make any decisions. It can therefore be ruled out that he is able to decide on such a serious geopolitical escalation, let alone assess the possible

consequences. The fact that Joe Biden is still in office at all shows the unconstitutional nature of the United States. He no longer conducts any business himself.

At least until January 20, 2025, foreign policy will be conducted by people in the background or underground: the deep state.

In our article "US Elections Decide on War or Peace", we explained that the choice between Trump or Harris was whether the deep state would retain its power or be pushed onto the defensive by Trump's election; in other words, it was a choice between war and peace. The people have made a landslide decision and now it is up to Trump to show that he really wants peace.

The deep state seems to fear – and this is the only way to explain the escalation efforts from Washington – that Trump will make peace with Russia. With this escalation, the deep state wants to ensure that Trump finds a direct conflict between the US and Russia as a welcome gift.

No statesmanlike response from Trump so far

With the American-led attacks on military targets in the Russian region of Bryansk and the subsequent attack with the British Storm Shadows in Kursk, which were also only possible with American logistics, one of those rare historical moments opened up for the future American president Trump, not only to set himself apart decisively from his domestic American rival with a few well-chosen words. The moment offered Trump an almost historic opportunity to reach out to Putin for peace even before he took office.

What would he have had to do to do so? Nothing more than repeat a short speech he gave in March 2023 that could not be surpassed in clarity:

"Donald Trump's statement was indeed a declaration of war – but not against Russia, but against the deep state."

"We have never been closer to World War III than we are today under Joe Biden. A global conflict between nuclear armed powers would mean death and destruction on a scale unmatched in human history. It would be nuclear Armageddon. Nothing is more important than avoiding that nightmare. We will avoid it but we need new leadership. Every day this proxy battle in Ukraine continues we risk global war. We must be absolutely clear that our objective is to immediately have a total cessation of hostilities; all shooting has to stop. This is the central issue. We need peace without delay. In addition, there must also be a complete commitment to dismantling the entire globalist Neocon establishment that is perpetually dragging us into endless wars, pretending to fight for freedom and democracy abroad while they turn us in to a third world country and a third world dictatorship right here at home. The state department, the defense bureaucracy, the intelligence services and all of the rest need to be completely overhauled and reconstituted to fire the Deep Staters and put America first – we have to put America first. Finally, we have to finish the process we began under my administration of fundamentally reevaluation NATO's purpose and NATO's mission. Our foreign policy establishment keeps trying to bull the world into conflict with a nuclear armed Russia based on the lie that Russia represents our greatest threat, but the greatest threat to Western civilization today is not Russia; it is probably more than anything else not Russia ourselves and some of the horrible USA-hating people that

> *represent us. It is the abolition of our national borders. It is the failure to police our own cities, it is the destruction of the rule of law from within, it is the collapse of the nuclear family and fertility rates like nobody can believe is happening. It is the Marxists who would have us become a godless nation worshipping at the altar of race and gender and environment and it's the globalist class that has made us totally dependent on China and other foreign countries that basically hate us."*

Donald Trump's statement was indeed a declaration of war – but not against Russia, but against the deep state.

He did away with the fairy tale that Russia is the greatest danger to the world, as has been propagated by practically all Western media for years. He clearly points out that the greatest danger comes from his own country, from the global neoconservatives (i.e. the deep state). He also questions the principles of NATO's existence as an extended arm of the deep state. The other statements concern the approach within the US.

Donald Trump's statements could not be clearer or more unequivocal. Never before in the history of the United States has an elected president criticized the leadership of his own country so harshly.

It would be a very good time for Trump to repeat and substantiate these statements in the context of developments regarding Oreshnik. So far, however, there has been no response.

Russia does not want a world war

In contrast to the neoconservative warmongers condemned by Trump in his statement, Russia has no interest in an escalation of the war in Ukraine or the Middle East for many reasons.

Although the vast majority of the population supports President Putin in achieving his goals in Ukraine, the population is also longing for peace. Economically, Russia is in an excellent position compared to its opponents: Ukraine as a state is economically destroyed and cannot survive a week without a constant infusion of billions from the West; Germany, as Ukraine's second main sponsor after the US, is economically on its knees and the rest of the EU is on the brink of a crisis. In relative terms, Russia is therefore in an advantageous position.

In absolute terms, however, there are problems: although Russia has one of the strongest gross domestic product increases worldwide – according to the Western IMF as well – this is offset by enormous defense spending. Labor costs are clearly increasing faster than the inflation figures would suggest. A few days ago, the Russian central bank raised the key interest rate to 21%. The Western sanctions have failed to achieve their goal in any way. They forced Russia to increase its industrial production quickly and efficiently, which was good for the country. The sanctions had mainly negative consequences for the sanctioning countries, especially for Germany. Nevertheless, sanctions that affect goods that Russia cannot do without and are not produced in Russia are brought into the country through parallel imports, which drives up inflation. Russia therefore also has a strong economic interest in ending the military conflict in order to use funds for civilian purposes, especially for large infrastructure projects.

Conclusion

The military events of the last few days have reshuffled the cards. Thanks to President Putin's ingenious move to deploy the new weapon "Oreshnik", Russia finds itself in a militarily and geopolitically advantageous situation.

The West, on the other hand, finds itself at an impasse from which it will be difficult to escape. Acceptable options for NATO's goals are receding into the distance. Not only is Ukraine in dire military straits – Russian troops are advancing on a broad front. The suicide mission initiated by NATO in the Kursk region is drawing to a costly close for Ukraine. The West's long-range weapons deployments are not producing war-changing results and are expensive. With Oreshnik and the Russians' revised military doctrine – not just nuclear doctrine – the Kremlin has a non-nuclear escalation level in its hands and at the same time is dealing the West the card that no one wants to hold. If it comes to an escalation, with the West continuing to deploy long-range weapons against Russia and Moscow responding with attacks on targets in NATO territory, NATO will not be able to successfully invoke Article 5: Firstly, an attack by Moscow – for example on military installations in Great Britain – would not be considered an aggressor act, but merely a reaction to British aggression against Russia. Secondly, the triggering of Art. 5 requires unanimity, which can be ruled out under the given circumstances.

It is to be hoped that this turn of events will lead to the West waking up and to a meeting at the negotiating table.

ARTICLE TAGS:

Analysis Trump, Donald Russia US Ukraine NATO INF Treaty Biden, Joe Gorbachev, Mikhail Harris, Kamala Deep State IMF MBDA