



What Would a Nuclear War Look Like?

Description

For eight years, NATO has backed puppet rulers in Ukraine, funded attacks on Donbass, repeatedly violated the Minsk Treaties, outlawed the speaking of Russian in the Luhansk and Donetsk Republics, and has destroyed democratic opposition and free media in Ukraine, leaving it a one-party government, essentially owned and financed by the US and administrated by US operatives.

Not much subtlety there.

Yet, somehow, the US has managed to convince the people of the US and other Western countries that Russia is the bad boy, is out of control and must be stopped.

In spite of all the above, Russia remained stoic and sought continually to keep a lid on the situation. It did, however, state firmly that the “red line” would be if Ukraine were to go nuclear, becoming a direct threat to Moscow. That would not be tolerated.

Surely, this was a sober heads-up to any sensible country that the one thing that must not happen would be for Ukraine to go nuclear. After all, once that Pandora’s Box was opened, the last barrier to possible nuclear war would be crossed.

For eight years, Russia had been goaded again and again by the West, yet they did not take the bait. Then, in February of 2022, at the annual Munich Security Conference, the President of Ukraine announced his intent to make Ukraine a nuclear country.

Five days later, Russia invaded Ukraine. Immediately, the US propaganda arm went into operation, and for months, even as Ukraine was consistently losing the war, at every turn, the Western media renewed its claims that the war was turning; that Russia was faltering, and the heroes of Ukraine were beating back the Great Bear.

But all the above is old news. Why, at this juncture, should we be reviewing it?

Well, its continued significance is that **NATO (or the US – they are virtually interchangeable at this point) has, from the beginning, behaved recklessly with the prospect of nuclear conflict.**

Are they mad? Or are they so foolish as to think that they have some sort of “edge” in a nuclear conflict? Or do they see this as a game of one-upmanship in which the only important concern is which antagonist has the greater bluster?

We can only speculate as to the answer to this quandary. But, setting this aside, we should be questioning, a) what is the likelihood that the West would be so foolhardy as to actually push the button and, b) what would the outcome look like?

As to the first question, considering that it's now becoming increasingly evident that the West have been misrepresenting the progress of the war; that the trained Azov forces are spent and replacements cannot be trained fast enough to go against the experienced Russian forces, the US is going to have to come up with another plan... and it will need to be something dramatic.

At this point, the one card they have not played is the nuke card.

They've claimed that the Russians have been either firing on or causing explosions in the Zaporizhzhya nuclear plant that they have held for some time. In essence, **they're being accused of bombing themselves in a facility that has long-since been taken.**

At this point, not many listeners are buying this explanation. So, what do they have left in their toolbox?

I've long felt that, as an end-run, what **the West might do would rely on an old favourite technique – a false flag attack.** Create a narrative and videos of an attack on, say, Kiev by Russia with a small nuclear warhead. Then announce that the warhead had been fired, killing hundreds of thousands. Then let loose the pre-prepared media blitz and invoke Article 5, justifying nuclear warfare.

It just might turn the tide of sympathy. But it would also open a door that could not once again be closed.

For decades, both Russia and the US have had large numbers of nukes aimed at each other, with a system of timed releases. Once the first button is pushed, interrupting the progression is difficult.

So, as to that second question – “What would a nuclear war look like?” there are many studies, but the most illustrative one I'm familiar with was produced by [Princeton](#).

It begins with a random single release in Eastern Europe and demonstrates the sizes and numbers of nuclear warheads, along with the release patterns.

It shows the trajectories and, in addition, shows diameters representing the degree of devastation by each missile.

The smaller nukes would cover all of Europe, leaving very little intact. Then the larger transatlantic nukes would take over – the state-of-the-art Sarmat missiles. Sarmat has the capacity to elude anti-missile defense systems. It travels at five times the speed of sound, weighs more than 200 tonnes and each one has multiple breakaway warheads.

The West has nothing like it.

So, what would the outcome be?

Well, each major US city would be targeted with multiple ICBMs, each big enough to destroy it. Most of the US would be carpeted with other ICBMs. The US would be destroyed within a few hours. An estimated 90 million people would be killed initially.

Those at ground zero would be vapourised. Those on the periphery of a bomb could escape if they were to get to concrete shelter very quickly. They would then need to remain sealed up for weeks, if not longer, until the majority of fallout had settled. It would be a gamble as to when exiting the building would be safe.

The northern border of the US would be destroyed, taking in Canadian border cities, such as Vancouver and Toronto. The southern border, with Mexico, would also go.

Next would be the movement of fallout.

As the video shows, those who live in or near a direct target would have no hope, but as can be seen, there are locations outside the US that are not targeted at all. Those locations that have no strategic advantage would not be targeted. So, if you were located in, say, Jamaica, you would not be hit, but, just as importantly, the Caribbean weather system – the trade winds – would carry any northern fallout away from you, as would the Gulf Stream.

Better still, the world is separated at the Equator by two weather systems that do not mix. Fallout in the north will be unlikely to travel to the south.

If you're located in South America, there are very few likely targets. It's unknown whether, say, Rio de Janeiro or Buenos Aires would be targets, but if not, South America may be the best place to be in the Western Hemisphere.

If anything, Europe and the Middle East would fare worse than North America.

Finally, there is the question of nuclear winter. No one can know whether this would last months or years and whether it would be localized or global.

Nuclear war is not a certainty, yet the West has been dangerously rattling sabres as though they are invincible and only others can be destroyed. This is quite false.

We cannot be certain that nuclear war will be undertaken, but if so, it will be quick. There will be no time to create an escape plan. You must already be in a location that you deem to be as safe as possible.

Editor's Note: The US government is overextending itself by interfering in every corner of the globe. It's all financed by massive amounts of money printing. However, the next financial crisis could end the whole charade soon.

The truth is, we're on the cusp of a global economic crisis that could eclipse anything we've seen before. That's exactly why *New York Times* best-selling author Doug Casey and his team just released a guide that explains what could come next and what you can do about it.

[Click here to download the PDF now.](#)

By Jeff Thomas

Featured image: The world's first nuclear explosion – the U.S. 'Trinity' atomic test in New Mexico, July 16, 1945. If a nuclear war breaks out today, the devastation caused by modern nuclear weapons would make Trinity's power look small by comparison. Most life on Earth would likely be wiped out. | U.S. Department of Energy

Category

1. Army-Wars-Conflict Zones-Military Tech.
2. Main

Date Created

09/24/2022