

President Obama Threatens President Putin With Nuclear War

By [Eric Zuesse](#)

Global Research, October 16, 2016

[Washington's Blog](#) 14 October 2016

Region: [Russia and FSU, USA](#)

Theme: [Militarization and WMD](#)

In-depth Report: [Nuclear War](#)

"It'll be at a time of our choosing," says U.S. Vice President Joe Biden, on NBC's "Meet the Press," aired on Sunday, October 16th.

Interviewer Chuck Todd had asked him, "Why would he [Obama] send a message out to Putin?"

Biden (image right) pursed his lips, paused, and said, with a grim look on his face, "We sent him the message."

Of course that didn't answer Todd's question, which was "Why?" Biden and Todd both remained silent for another tense moment.

Then, Biden picked up again: "We have the capacity to do it, and, uh," and Todd interrupted him there with "He'll know it?"

Biden replied: "He'll know it, and it'll be at a time of our choosing, and under circumstances that have the greatest impact. Uh, the capacity to do, to fundamentally alter the election, is not what people think; and, uh, I tell you what: to the extent that they do ['do' presumably meaning: fundamentally alter the election], we will be proportionate in what we do. And, uh,"

Todd again interrupted his interviewee, and said, "So, a message is going to be sent. Will the public know?" Biden replied, "Hope not."

Full Biden Interview on NBC Meet The Press, October 16, 2016. Relevant section starts at 11'.47"

Of course, that "Hope not" could mean many things. It might mean: A blitz nuclear attack in line with our government's belief that we now enjoy [Nuclear Primacy](#) (an idea that was first [published by the Council on Foreign Relations](#) in 2006, and which has never yet been renounced by the U.S. government, during the decade since). That would be very much a public response, which Biden would "hope not" to be 'necessary'. In other words: Biden might have meant, there: "I hope it won't have to be that." But, clearly, Biden isn't wanting the public to understand anything, other than that President Obama has threatened President Putin, with something, and that it will be "proportionate," and the excuse for it will be — if it will happen — that Putin had done something which Obama thinks caused Hillary Clinton to lose the election to Donald Trump.

Standing behind what Biden is saying there, is the belief that Putin *does* have in his possession some option that might “fundamentally alter the election.” This is clearly a threat that’s meant to deter Putin from doing something that Putin hasn’t yet done. Obama is telling Putin that either the winner will be the person he wants to be his successor, or else — or else *what?*

In other words: what Biden is saying, is that, if Trump wins this election, then there is going to be some sudden, unannounced, U.S. government response against Putin, and that only after it is over, will the U.S. government explain to the public why it did.

But, of course, that assumes Americans will still be alive, even if Russians are not; and, so, if the “proportionate” response turns out to be a blitz nuclear attack against Russia, then anyone who is still alive will be wondering: what was it ‘proportionate’ to?

The United States is no longer — at least not in Syria — actually fighting the thing that Trump calls “extremist Islamic terrorism”: we are instead [arming Al Qaeda in Syria to overthrow and replace Putin’s ally, Bashar al-Assad, there](#).

All of the U.S. government’s talk against “ISIL” (the Saudis’ preferred acronym for “ISIS”) is mere distraction from the tens of thousands of other jihadist fighters from other jihadist groups that have also been imported by the U.S. and Saudi governments into Syria as Obama’s and the Saudis’ “boots on the ground” to overthrow Assad there.

The leadership now for all of those jihadist groups (except for ISIS itself) is, in fact, Al Qaeda in Syria, which has gone under the name “al-Nusra.” Nusra is supplying the leadership now to all the jihadist factions that have been sent into Syria; Nusra is the only jihadist group that possesses the long experience and training in jihad and military matters, which is needed in order to be able to overthrow Assad. [Al Qaeda is now America’s essential ally, at doing what the U.S. government most wants to do: overthrow and replace Assad](#).

The U.S. is deadly serious about that intention, as can be seen [here from the NBC News preview video of their interview with Biden](#), from which the above quotations are sourced. Looking at Biden’s face there, one can see that this is deadly serious. This isn’t about sexual aggression — either Donald Trump’s or Bill Clinton’s — it’s about the survival of civilization, or else nuclear war.

There have been many reports in the U.S. press saying that Obama has, ever since at least October 6th, been contemplating an all-out U.S. bombing campaign to bring down Assad. But that would mean war with Russia, which has been actively bombing Nusra and all the other jihadists in Syria.

Hillary Clinton is urging a [“no-fly zone” in Syria](#), so that we can do to Assad what we did to another ally of Moscow, Muammar Gaddafi. However, when that was done to Gaddafi, Putin stood aside and wasn’t supplying military assistance to Gaddafi, which would have enabled Gaddafi to wipe out the fundamentalist Muslims who were trying to overthrow him. Russia is involved actively, this time, to prevent happening in Syria what happened in Libya. A no-fly zone in Syria would thus mean U.S. war against Russia.

These are tense times. Any escalation that the U.S. can do against Russia, can be met by an escalation that Russia can do against the United States.

Consequently, whatever escalation Obama is now threatening against Putin, might be met by an escalation on the other side. Where will it stop, or would it even *be able* to stop?

Whatever escalation Obama might consider to be ‘proportionate’, could consequently end up ending the world as we know it — and not for the better. [Hillary Clinton has threatened Putin with war](#); now Barack Obama has done likewise.

Whatever Biden’s assignment here actually was from Obama, one thing about it is clear: this President is determined that Hillary Clinton be his successor, and Obama will target anyone who gets in his way if he doesn’t win his way on this. And Obama wants the American public to know that this is how he feels about the matter.

This Biden-interview is really intended, in that sense, to be a threat aimed at America’s voters, telling them, telling each one of us: Vote for Hillary Clinton, or else! He’s not telling us *what* that “or else!” is going to be — and maybe he himself has no *accurate* idea of how far it will ultimately cycle and go. Ultimately, whatever he thinks it would be, might not turn out to be the last step in this cycle of escalation — unless it’s going to go *directly* to a blitz attack against Russia.

Obama is thus coercing us, before he coerces Putin. He’s telling us: *If* we vote against Hillary Clinton — if she loses this election — then President Obama has something in mind that we won’t like — and he won’t wait until the next President is inaugurated on 20 January 2017 to do it, whatever ‘it’ might be. Obama here is threatenting not only Vladimir Putin, but the American people. Even if Obama truly believes that he alone possesses all the power, he does not, unless he possesses the power to terrorize America’s voters to elect Hillary Clinton, even if we otherwise would not.

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of [They’re Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010](#), and of [CHRIST’S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity](#).

The original source of this article is [Washington's Blog](#)
Copyright © [Eric Zuesse](#), [Washington's Blog](#), 2016

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Eric Zuesse](#)

About the author:

Investigative historian Eric Zuesse is the author, most recently, of [They’re Not Even Close: The Democratic vs. Republican Economic Records, 1910-2010](#), and of [CHRIST’S VENTRILOQUISTS: The Event that Created Christianity](#).

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