

# Doug Casey on the Likelihood of Nuclear War With Russia

by [Doug Casey](#)



**International Man:** Recently, we've seen what appears to be an escalation in the conflict between Russia and Ukraine.

There is an excellent chance the US government was behind the sabotage of the Nord Stream pipelines, Russia has annexed four regions of Ukraine, and President Zelensky announced an accelerated bid to join NATO.

What do you make of this?

**Doug Casey:** I'd say that the odds are extremely high, approaching certainty, that the US was complicit in the sabotage. It certainly had the Motive, Means, and Opportunity—the three elements necessary to warrant suspicion in a criminal investigation.

The US has unique capabilities for this kind of mischief—an air-launched drone torpedo or a submarine aren't available to just any terror group. It was a major operation, not something that a few scuba divers could pull off. Apparently, tons of explosives were used to blow these things up.

Biden and other US officials previously said they didn't want the Nord Stream to go through and planned to prevent it. A boldly idiotic thing to say since the pipeline is neither its property or business.

The narrative that the Russians did it is completely insane. Putin could simply turn off the gas until it was convenient to be turned back on; now that option is gone. The Russians wouldn't limit their own options.

If it's proven that the US did it, then the Russians and/or the Germans will have to engage in a tit-for-tat retaliation to punish the US for this sabotage. That may be tantamount to an act of war, but once the culprit is proven, they have to take action. This thing isn't over. The culprit will be found.

As far as Russia annexing Crimea and the regions of the Ukraine in question, it seems to me—from a historical point of view—that would be par for the course. Remember that borders have been flowing and ethnic groups moving for a thousand years in that part of the world. In any event, it makes no sense to take sides in disputes between nation-states. In this case, it amounts to the US sticking its nose into a border war between two shit-hole countries.

That said, being as objective as possible, I'd say that the Russians have a certain amount of right on their side. They've been mightily provoked since the Maidan Revolution of 2014 and the attack by the Ukrainian Army on the Donbas. It's too bad that this is spinning out of control—largely because of US intervention. In a rational world, it would basically be worth a couple of columns on the sixth page of the *New York Times* and then forgotten.

As for Zelensky accelerating the bid to join NATO, it's insanely stupid. Zelensky is a corrupt nothing/nobody puppet who's being manufactured into a hero. The strutting little megalomaniac has apparently been paid at least half a billion dollars to be an authoritarian, jailing opposition leaders, closing down dissident newspapers, and building a secret police force. Ukraine joining NATO at this point would be asking for World War 3. Of course, NATO should have been abolished after the collapse of the Soviet Empire in 1991. But now it's become an institution, almost impossible to get rid of.

The chances of a war between NATO and Russia are extremely high. Instead of talking about getting rid of Putin, the world would be better off if they got rid of Zelensky.

**International Man:** Vladimir Putin recently gave a speech in which he said:

“The West is ready to cross every line to preserve the neo-colonial system which allows it to live off the world, to plunder it thanks to the domination of the dollar and technology, to collect an actual tribute from humanity, to extract its primary source of unearned prosperity, the rent paid to the hegemon. The preservation of this annuity is their main, real and absolutely self-serving motivation. This is why total de-sovereignization is in their interest. This explains their aggression towards independent states, traditional values and authentic cultures, their attempts to undermine international and integration processes, new global currencies and technological development centers they cannot control. It is critically important for them to force all countries to surrender their sovereignty to the United States.”

What's your take on this?

**Doug Casey:** I've listened to a number of Putin's speeches.

It's fashionable to make him out as being not only the devil incarnate but irrational and somebody that wants to conquer Europe and perhaps destroy the world in the process. But in fact, compared to all of the other European leaders, he's the most cool-headed, the most thoughtful, and the one with the most perspective.

He is absolutely right when he says that the West is acting as a hegemon. In particular, the US has been exporting dollars for decades—which have allowed it to live way above its means—and control the world by controlling the world's monetary system. With the dollar accepted as the international reserve currency, backed up by institutions like the World Bank and the IMF, and a giant military with bases in over 100 countries, the US can basically call the shots for other cultures and countries.

Let me explain. I like American culture. Despite the fact the US is rapidly devolving into a police state, it's still by far the most individualistic, liberty-oriented, and freewheeling culture the world has ever seen. But at the same time, I understand his resentment.

The world is covered with McDonald's and Pizza Huts, Hollywood movies, Coca-Cola, mass consumer advertising, and a thousand other trends, ideas, and artifacts generated in the US. Call them "good" or "bad," but they have absolutely acted to destroy local cultures. T-shirts, blue jeans, and rock music assault your eyes and ears everywhere, from the biggest cities to the upper reaches of the Amazon and the Congo.

I think they're mostly good things in themselves. But it's easy to see how a traditionalist, someone who values cultural stability and diversity, could view them as aggressive threats, as cultural imperialism. In fact, we've destroyed the local culture everywhere. I understand his unhappiness with aspects of this.

Vlad makes some valid points.

I know you're not supposed to say that since he's been designated the new enemy, in the mold of Saddam, Qadhafi, Assad, Noriega, and a dozen others in recent history. Unfortunately, though, Americans' opinions are products of what they're fed by the media, not actual facts. If they were well-informed and thought about it, they'd realize their real enemies weren't foreign nonentities but the Bidens, Bushes, Obamas, and the US Deep State in general.

**International Man:** It seems tensions with Russia are reaching a crescendo.

What do you think is the likelihood of the US or NATO becoming directly involved in combat?

**Doug Casey:** As I said, there's no reason for any conflict between Russia and the US. In fact, there are now fewer communists in Russia than there are in US universities.

Russia under Putin has tried to reach a rapprochement with Western Europe and the US numerous times, and they've been rejected.

It makes me think that our leaders are more psychopathic than Russia's.

Will the US become directly involved in combat? I don't think so. The US has already pissed away \$60 billion, or who knows how much, supporting the terminally corrupt Zelensky regime. More and more Americans are coming to the conclusion that it's against our interests. I doubt there's any support to send American soldiers over there, and it greatly increases the chances of nuclear blasts leveling most US cities.

Direct involvement seems unlikely at this point, even though we're dealing with sociopaths and, worse, who control the world's major governments. So don't accuse me of being a permabear... I'm an optimist.

**International Man:** There is a lot of talk in the mainstream media about whether Russia will use tactical nuclear weapons in Ukraine. David Petraeus and other Deep Staters have suggested the US and NATO would directly attack Russian forces in Ukraine as a response.

Could the media and Deep State be laying the groundwork for some sort of incident, staged or otherwise?

What are [the implications](#) of people like Petraeus openly talking about directly attacking Russian forces?

**Doug Casey:** Again, once people reach a high level in any government, it's proof—*ipso facto*—that they're sociopaths. Many are narcissistic and power-hungry psychopaths. You don't get the "best and brightest" walking the halls of Mordor or the Deathstar.

That certainly includes generals or ex-generals like Petraeus. In today's world, once a soldier reaches a general's rank, he's a self-promoting bureaucrat first and foremost.

I'll draw your attention to the movie *Dr. Strangelove*. Once someone gets enough stars on their shoulders, they start thinking like George C. Scott's General Buck E. Turgidson or Sterling Hayden's Jack D. Ripper in *Dr. Strangelove*.

It's actually a type of psychosis that overtakes people once they have too much power. Anything's possible with these people.

I don't support either Washington or Moscow. At the moment—let me shock some readers—Washington is much more dangerous than Moscow, with the current administration totally controlled by Jacobins and other strident ideologues. Americans should be terrified that one of their politicians could push the wrong button and destroy the world, whether with nuclear, cyber, or biological weapons.

**International Man:** Is there such a thing as a limited nuclear war between the US and Russia? If not, what does full-scale nuclear war look like, and what is the likelihood of it happening?

Is it worth risking this outcome over a country that most Americans cannot even find on a map?

**Doug Casey:** As you know, my belief is that a government—if you're going to have government at all—should have nothing but police to protect citizens from violence within a country, a court system to

allow them to adjudicate disputes without resorting to force, and a strictly defensive military, kept within our borders. Our current government, however, has a life of its own, detached from the country it rules.

Seeing the kind of people that we have in Washington, with actual Jacobins in charge, it's understandable how the Russians could be paranoid of the US military machine and the US government.

Could we have limited nuclear war?

It's possible. Perhaps the Russians will, if pushed up against the wall and invaded, set off a couple of small tactical nukes just as a warning to show they're serious.

But if it goes to a global thermonuclear war, it's going to set civilization back hundreds of years.

The people that are in back of fomenting and promoting the Ukraine war should be hauled out of office and tried for war crimes and crimes against humanity. These fools are toying with what could soon be the biggest disaster in world history.

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. And most people won't be prepared for what's coming. That's exactly why bestselling author Doug Casey and his team [just released a free report](#) with all the details on how to survive an economic collapse.