

The Privatization of Nuclear War. What Is More Dangerous? A Mini-Nuke or COVID-19?

By [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#)
Global Research, April 11, 2022

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#), [Military Militarization](#)
and [WMD](#), [US NATO War Agenda](#)
In-depth Report: [Nuclear War](#), [UKRAINE](#)
[REPORT](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the “Translate Website” drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

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

Visit and follow us on Instagram at [@globalresearch_crg](#).

First published on March 22, 2022

“Meeting with Congress, Zelensky Asks for More Weapons and a No-Fly Zone” according to the New York Times.

A No Fly Zone is tantamount to a World War III scenario.

Who writes and/or determines the content of Zelensky’s speeches?


Zelensky addressed President Joe Biden in a carefully scripted text:

“You are the leader of your great nation. I wish you to be the leader of the world. Being the leader of the world means to be the leader of peace.”

Zelensky is a political proxy, an obedient lackey. Visibly his speeches had been carefully crafted on behalf of his U.S. sponsors, i.e. Powerful factions within the “Deep State” in support of America’s defense giants.

The Military Industrial Complex has made billions since the Russian invasion. Lockheed Martin, Raytheon, Northrop, BAE et al. have seen their shares go fly high, amidst a slump in market values following the Russia invasion on February 24th (for more details see [Asia Times](#)).

Defence company share prices vs S&P 500



Orange = Lockheed Martin; cyan = Boeing; yellow = Raytheon; indigo = BAe Systems; purple = Northrop Grumman; blue = S&P 500.
Trading View

Source: Asia Times

Largest Military Budget in US History

In the immediate wake of Russia's invasion, the US Congress approved (on behalf of defense contractors, private mercenary companies, et al.), the "largest ever defense spending bill" in US history, "while U.S. allies in Europe pledged to dramatically ramp up their defense spending to counter the Russian threat, measures that will bring lucrative new contracts to the arms industry" ([The Hill](#), emphasis added).

Did the defense giants have foreknowledge of the Russian attack?

A month prior to the invasion: "[top western arms companies](#) were briefing investors about a likely boost to their profits". Gregory J Hayes, the chief executive of US defense giant Raytheon, stated on a January 25:"

"Raytheon and Lockheed Martin — are openly telling their investors that tensions between the countries are good for business."

Let us be under no illusions: A World War III scenario involving the use of nuclear weapons directed against Russia and [China](#) as well as against several non-nuclear states has been on the drawing board of the Pentagon for more than 20 years.


And America's major defense contractors which produce the nukes are increasingly involved in strategic decisions pertaining to their use as well as the formulation of US nuclear military doctrine. There is a powerful faction within the Deep State which considers that a nuclear is "winnable". And winnable WWII scenarios and simulations (most of them classified) are routinely contemplated.

Analysis: The Dangers of Nuclear War: Michel Chossudovsky

Comments: [Link to Odysee](#)

Post 9/11 Nuclear Doctrine: “The Cold War Goes Hot” under G.W.B.

A dangerous shift in US nuclear doctrine occurred in 2001 under the Bush administration.



In early 2002, the text of George W. Bush’s Nuclear Posture Review had already been leaked, several months prior to the release of the September 2002 National Security Strategy (NSS) which defined, “Preemption” as: “the anticipatory use of force in the face of an imminent attack”.

The Doctrine of *Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD)* of the Cold War Era was scrapped and replaced with the *Doctrine of Preemptive Nuclear War (PNW)*, namely the “*peacemaking use*” of nuclear weapons as a means of “*self-defense*” against both nuclear and non-nuclear weapons states.

One thing was replaced by its opposite. MAD is real, PNW is fake. There is no such thing as “a peace-making use” of nuclear weapons.

Secret Meeting on Hiroshima Day 2003. Setting the Stage for “The Privatization of Nuclear War”

A year later, on August 6, 2003, on Hiroshima Day, a secret meeting was held behind closed doors at Strategic Command Headquarters at the Offutt Air Force Base in Nebraska.

“Senior executives from the nuclear industry and the military industrial complex were in attendance. This mingling of defense contractors, scientists and policy-makers was not intended to commemorate Hiroshima. The meeting was intended to set the stage for the development of a new generation of “smaller”, “safer” and “more usable” nuclear weapons, to be used in the “in-theater nuclear wars” of the 21st Century.”
([Michel Chossudovsky](#), August 2011)

This meeting was instrumental in setting the stage for the privatization of nuclear war leading up to Obama’s \$1.2 trillion dollar nuclear weapons program, which is now slated to increase to \$2 trillion by 2030.

Diplomacy is scrapped in favor of Big Money. The privatization of both conventional and nuclear war is the driving force behind the crisis in Ukraine, coupled with the influx of foreign mercenaries recruited by private companies (on contract to the Pentagon and

NATO).

While Biden is officially against the use of nukes on a first strike basis, the lobby groups acting on behalf of the defence giants are calling the shots.

Nuclear War Is “Good for Business”, But It Requires a “Human Face” and a “Peace-Making Mandate”

The Defense Giants are pushing the preemptive nuclear war doctrine with Russia, allegedly as a means of self-defence and national security for America and its allies. And the media applauds. Public acceptance of WMDs is predicated on a public relations campaign which posits that mini-nukes as humanitarian bombs.

The “peacemaking use” of nuclear weapons, missiles and fighter jets is being used as a marketing strategy on behalf of Lockheed Martin, Raytheon, Northrup Grumman, BAE, et al



The latest state of the art B61-12 mini-nuke, the “more usable” “low yield” nuclear weapons is portrayed as a “humanitarian bomb” “harmless to civilians” because the explosion is underground.

The B61-12 “peace making bomb” has a maximum yield of 50 kilotons which is more than three times that of a [Hiroshima bomb \(15 kilotons\)](#) which resulted in excess of 100,000 deaths in matter of minutes.

Humanitarian Preemptive Nukes are part of a dangerous ideology as well as a marketing strategy on behalf of the defense giants. The unspoken reality of a nuclear war is “Mutual Assured Destruction” (MAD) and the End of Humanity as we know it.


Mini Nukes Versus SARS-CoV2

The corporate media is complicit. Lies through omission. There is no informative “fear campaign” on something which is real.

The REAL dangers of nuclear war which threatens the future of humanity do not make the headlines.

In contrast, a 24/7 fear campaign spearheaded by the media in the course of the last two years has focussed on the deadly impact of COVID-19, which according to the WHO is similar to seasonal influence.

Inventing Fear: “Why Is the Virus Such a Threat”



V- the Virus is portrayed as a “Terrorist”

A sensationalist (scary?) BBC report portrays the SARS-CoV2 as a “Weapon of Mass Destruction”.

“Why is the Virus such a Threat”, because it is a “hit and run killer” with “brilliant evolutionary tactic”:

“Master of Deception. In the early stages of an infection the virus is able to deceive the body. ...

It [the virus] behaves like a ‘hit and run’ killer

The amount of virus in our body begins to peak the day before we begin to get sick. ...

“This is a really brilliant evolutionary tactic – you don’t go to bed, you go out and have a good time,” says Prof Lehner.

So the virus is like a dangerous driver fleeing the scene – the virus has moved on to the next victim long before we either recover or die.

In stark terms, “the virus doesn’t care” if you die, says [Cambridge] Prof Lehner, “this is a hit and run virus”.

It does peculiar and unexpected things to the body ([BBC, James Gallagher, October 22, 2020](#), emphasis added)

The original source of this article is Global Research

Copyright © [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#), Global Research, 2022

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#)

About the author:

Michel Chossudovsky is an award-winning author, Professor of Economics (emeritus) at the University of Ottawa, Founder and Director of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG), Montreal, Editor of Global Research. He has taught as visiting professor in Western Europe, Southeast Asia, the Pacific and Latin America. He has served as economic adviser to governments of developing countries and has acted as a consultant for several international organizations. He is the author of 13 books. He is a contributor to the Encyclopaedia Britannica. His writings have been published in more than twenty languages. In 2014, he was awarded the Gold Medal for Merit of the Republic of Serbia for his writings on NATO's war of aggression against Yugoslavia. He can be reached at crgeditor@yahoo.com

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