

Is America Trying to Bait Iran Into a ‘Limited’ Nuclear War?

By [Drago Bosnic](#)

Global Research, May 02, 2024

Region: [Middle East & North Africa, USA](#)
Theme: [Military and WMD, US NATO](#)
[War Agenda](#)
In-depth Report: [IRAN: THE NEXT WAR?](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name (only available in desktop version).

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Click the share button above to email/forward this article to your friends and colleagues. Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

First published on April 15, 2024

[Global Research Referral Drive: Our Readers Are Our Lifeline](#)

Accusing countries of alleged intentions or ongoing programs to acquire weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) has long been the mainstay of America's foreign policy.

Regardless of whether it was a completely unfounded claim or one based on solid intelligence, the openly imperialist foreign policy of the United States is such that it's virtually impossible to survive it without resorting to WMDs.

North Korea is probably the most prominent example of this, as the small country (relative to its neighbors) was being directly threatened by the US only half a decade ago, [while it now fields an arsenal worthy of a "pocket superpower"](#).

Worse yet for the Pentagon, Pyongyang now also has a robust tactical arsenal, in addition to its strategic one that can reach virtually any target in the continental US. Interestingly, [this now includes hypersonic weapons](#), a field in which Washington DC is now lagging behind Pyongyang, Beijing and Moscow.

Ironically, if the US stops complaining about a country having nuclear weapons (or any other type of WMDs), then that country is safe, as Washington DC will know it can't act with impunity.

However, when a country most likely doesn't have WMDs, the US keeps accusing and threatening it before launching an illegal full-scale invasion.

The example of Iraq serves as a painful lesson of that strategy.

The whole world remembers the decades of US/NATO aggression in that unfortunate country, as well as [millions of dead, wounded, displaced, etc.](#) However, that's obviously not enough, as Washington DC has been eyeing other countries in the region, particularly Iraq's neighbor Iran. And yet, the window of opportunity for a successful conventional conflict with Tehran is effectively gone, [as Americans are increasingly uninterested in joining the US military](#) and its endless wars in the Middle East and elsewhere.

For decades, the US has been trying to keep Iran as one of its priority targets, with constant accusations that Tehran is [supposedly in possession of either a working WMD](#), particularly a (thermo)nuclear weapon, or [it's allegedly close to fielding one](#). Virtually the same narrative is being recycled to this very day, which further suggests that Washington DC wants to keep the "bomb Tehran" option relevant for as long as possible. Just last week, [the mainstream propaganda machine insisted that "Iran edges close to weapons capability"](#). Namely, according to Western media, the Middle Eastern superpower has been ["edging close" and "it's about to build \[nuclear\] weapons"](#) for well over 20 years now. The US has been using this narrative to build capabilities that are part of [the Pentagon's new doctrine](#) that essentially boils down to a rather liberal usage of low-yield thermonuclear weapons.

Such a possibility is quite concerning, particularly [against the backdrop of the latest clashes between Iran and Israel](#). Iranian strikes over the weekend, a response to the previous Israeli airstrike on its consulate building in Damascus that killed several high-ranking officers, showed that Tehran has the capability to strike targets anywhere in the Middle East. And while Israel and its allies insist that the strike was unsuccessful as they've [managed to intercept 99% of the missiles and drones](#), the available footage shows that [such claims are overoptimistic](#), to say the least. Either way, Iran demonstrated a very robust long-range strike capability. This further undermines Washington DC's conventional capabilities against Tehran, as the Pentagon is simply unable to field enough forces for any sort of action against it. However, it should be noted that the US has been threatening Iran well before its latest clashes with Israel.

Namely, on February 4, US National Security Advisor Jake Sullivan [refused to rule out the possibility of strikes inside Iran](#). US/NATO attacks on the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (IRGC) and its allied militias in Iraq and Syria were already underway at the time. However, once again, the viability of strikes inside Iran is not the best, as there are close to 90 million people in the country, which also has a very robust domestic military industry, as well as a sizeable stockpile of ballistic missiles and drones, as demonstrated during the latest events over the weekend. In addition, as previously mentioned, the US itself is also a far cry from 2003 when it could muster hundreds of thousands of soldiers, as well as those of its vassals and satellite states. In other words, the Pentagon simply doesn't have the conventional forces to pull off pretty much anything meaningful against Iran or [even its proxies in the area](#).

So, what option does that leave the US with? Well, WMDs, of course. And indeed, [Washington DC has an undisclosed number of W76-2 warheads](#) with an [extremely low yield of 2-7 kt](#) (kilotons of TNT). This is upwards of only 10% of the destructive power of the "Fat Man" atomic bomb dropped on Nagasaki on August 9, 1945. Basic military logic implies that using such weapons against near-peer adversaries is pointless. For instance, [a country like Russia](#) that has multi-megaton monstrosities [such as the unrivaled RS-28 "Sarmat"](#) and whose retaliation would [devastate the entire NATO](#), would certainly not tolerate it. Thus, the

only viable explanation is that the US wants to use such warheads in a conflict with a non-nuclear power. Faced with [dwindling conventional capabilities](#), America is left with only one way to try to blackmail the rest of the world into accepting its vaunted “[rules-based world order](#)” – nuclear war.

This is also completely in line with the overall US military strategy – [attack only those who can't shoot back](#). For the time being, Iran is the only major rival without thermonuclear weapons (officially at least), making it the “perfect target”. However, this still leaves the obvious question – [what if Tehran has thermonuclear weapons](#)? Nobody could blame Iran for wanting to protect itself from any hostile forces seeking to enslave or destroy it, but the prospect of an uncontrollable escalation still remains strong, meaning that restraint should be exercised by all sides and backdoor channels should be kept open at all times. The main issue lies in the fact that the US is desperate to [prevent the enlargement of BRICS+](#), a truly historically unprecedented effort to create a better world in which there's an actual functioning international law and where [\(neo\)colonialism](#) will be suppressed (if not eradicated once and for all).

*

Note to readers: Please click the share button above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

This article was originally published on [InfoBrics](#).

[Drago Bosnic](#) is an independent geopolitical and military analyst. He is a regular contributor to Global Research.

Featured image is from InfoBrics

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Drago Bosnic](#), Global Research, 2024

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Drago Bosnic](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca