



## NATO Wants to Place Nuclear Missiles on Finland's Russian Border — Finland Says Yes.

### Description

*According to Newsweek, on October 26th, "Finland Will Allow NATO to Place Nuclear Weapons on Border With Russia". They cite Finnish media reports. Allegedly, a condition that NATO had placed on Finland to join NATO was to allow America's nuclear missiles to be positioned on Finland's Russian border, which is closer to Moscow than any other except Ukraine's. Whereas Ukraine's would be 5 minutes from blitz-nuking Moscow so as to preemptively decapitate Russia's retaliatory command, Finland's would be 7 minutes — only around 120 seconds longer for Russia to be able to launch its retaliatory strikes.*

*Finland now is to vote on the bill joining NATO, on that basis (i.e., to become America's spearhead to defeat Russia in WW III). Obviously (assuming that NATO had, indeed, given Finland's leaders to believe that saying yes to this would increase NATO's likelihood of expediting Finland's application to join), NATO is set upon checkmating Russia into capitulation if Finland does join.*

Newsweek reports also that

"The U.S. already has around 100 nuclear weapons in Europe, positioned in Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and Turkey according to the Federation of American Scientists. Britain and France, both NATO members, also maintain their own independent nuclear arsenals."

None of those countries borders Russia. They're all much farther away.

During the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, JFK refused to allow the Soviet Union to place its missiles only [1,131](#) miles away from Washington DC and warned that the U.S. would launch WW III if they did; so, the Soviet Union decided not to.

The Finnish border reaches as close as 507 miles away from Moscow, at the Finnish city of Kotka. The Ukrainian border reaches significantly closer: 317 miles from Shostka to Moscow, and 353 miles from Sumy to Moscow — as being the Russia-bordering nation that would pose the *biggest* danger to Russia if added to NATO. Finland is #2 — only Ukraine is even worse in a Russian view.

Russia invaded Ukraine in order to be able to move that potential 317 miles back to at least the 1,131 miles that everyone in 1962 agreed would be too close to Washington DC and therefore justification for America to launch WW III to prevent.

The reason why the difference between 317 miles versus 507 miles is only around two minutes, is that the slowest part of the flight is the earliest, while accelerating. Practically speaking, for Washington to position its nuclear-warheaded missiles 507 miles from The Kremlin is virtually the same as to position them at the nearest point on Ukraine's border. One can already see that Russia actively resists this.

In 1962, missiles were far slower than they are today. So, in order for there to be an equivalency between the 1,131 miles from Cuba in 1962, Russia would need to keep U.S. missiles about 2,000 miles from America's closest land-based nuclear missiles today. The present situation is considerably more dangerous to Russia than the Cuban Missile Crisis was to America in 1962.

According to leading American scientists who specialize in evaluating such matters, America's recent nuclear-weapons policy "creates exactly what one would expect to see, if a nuclear-armed state were planning to have the capacity to fight and win a nuclear war by disarming enemies with a surprise first strike."

*Newsweek's* disclosure on October 26th suggests that this is, indeed, what the U.S. Government has been, and is, planning for: "to fight and win a nuclear war by disarming enemies with a surprise first strike." (That meta-strategy is called "Nuclear Primacy," and in America it replaced the "M.A.D." or Mutually Assured Destruction meta-strategy in around 2006.)

During WW II, Finland was on the Nazi side and participated with the Germans in their "Operation Barbarossa invasion of the Soviet Union." If it joins NATO, Finland would be repeating that now, but *only* against Russia.

All U.S. foreign policies, in both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, are "neocon," and that means funded by and for U.S.-and-allied billionaires and centi-millionaires — *not* for ANY public — in order to increase yet *further* the scope of their global empire.

by Eric Zuesse

### Category

1. Army-Wars-Conflict Zones-Military Tech.
2. Main
3. Politics-Geopolitics-Gov.-Events

### Date Created

10/28/2022