“With regard to further actions, it is entirely up to those who make the relevant decisions today. If our signal is not heard, then, as I said on Nov. 23, we will deploy other defense means, including the adoption of tough countermeasures and deployment of the main attack force.

“The station has been put on combat duty, which means that it has begun to work as a finished facility, although a number of parameters are still to be built up over time. . . .”

General Makarov Warns Of Possible Nuclear War

Gen. Nikolai Makarov, the chief of the General Staff of the Russian Armed Forces, stated on Nov. 17, 2011, “I cannot rule out that, in certain circumstances, local and regional armed conflicts could grow into a large-scale war, possibly even with nuclear weapons.” Addressing the Russian Public Chamber, a Kremlin advisory body which includes numerous policy heavyweights, Makarov stated that “Russia could be involved in a conflict where weapons of mass destruction could be used. . . . The possibility of local armed conflicts virtually along the entire perimeter of the [Russian] border has grown dramatically.”

Makarov was referring specifically to NATO’s expansion eastward since the collapse of the Soviet Union—including efforts to get Ukraine and Georgia to join NATO—as well as the U.S.-led plan to place missile defense systems along the Russian border. But his remarks are also an unmistakeable warning in the context of the British-Obama drumbeat for war against Iran and Syria.

Then, on Feb. 15, 2012, Markarov said that Russia has the right to use nuclear weapons if its sovereignty is threatened. In an interview with the radio station Ekho Moskvy, he said, “We are certainly not planning to fight against the whole of NATO, but if there is a threat to the integrity of the Russian Federation, we have the right to use nuclear weapons, and we will.”

The general said, according to RIA Novosti, that Russia’s nuclear deterrent is the cornerstone of strategic stability, and serious efforts are being taken by the Russian government to modernize the country’s nuclear triad.

Dr. Theodore Postol: BMD Threatens Russia

In 2007, the George W. Bush Administration turned down Russian President Vladimir Putin’s offer of cooperation on a radar system to protect against missile threats—as a substitute for Bush’s planned deployment of a ballistic missile defense (BMD) system in Poland and the Czech Republic, which Russia saw as a strategic threat. The U.S. Missile Defense Agency (MDA) claimed that Bush’s plan was no threat to Russia, because the BMD system was too limited in scope.

President Putin and Russian Chief of Staff Gen. Col. Yuri Baluyevsky strongly disagreed, and promised an “asymmetric response” if the U.S. BMD deployment in Europe went ahead. It turns out, a top U.S. official also disagrees.
As Marsha Freeman reported in *EIR*, Sept. 14, 2007, Dr. Theodore Postol of MIT, a nuclear engineer and former scientific advisor to the Chief of Naval Operations, in an Aug. 28 briefing, declared that the proposed U.S. BMD system is a threat to Russia, and also proposed alternatives. What’s at stake, he stated, is a “policy confrontation with Russia, if Russian complaints are technically legitimate.”

Dr. Postol took apart a briefing given in Europe in March by the director of the U.S. Missile Defense Agency, who had attempted to assure “allies and friends” that the new system would not be a threat to Russia. But the presentation used numbers that are incorrect, for the speed of the Russian ICBMs and of the interceptors, and the relative distances involved, Postol said. Using the correct numbers, it is clear that, minutes after a Russian ICBM launch, the missile could be intercepted by a Polish-based missile. “The bottom line” he said, is that a “two-stage interceptor placed in Poland, could take on all [Russian] ICBMs [stationed] east of the Ural Mountains, launched toward the East Coast of the United States.”

Freeman explained that the Russians are concerned that these BMD systems would be used to suppress Russia’s retaliatory capability following a U.S. attack, hitting Russian second-strike missiles in their boost phase.

Dr. Postol expressed serious concerns about the effectiveness of the U.S. interceptor system. “It is not clear this thing is going to work,” he said. For that reason, “the current system is not a threat at all, but could be perceived as the leading edge of a more advanced system.” The speaker quoted from Presidential National Security Directive 23, of Dec. 6, 2002, which stated that the U.S. would begin to deploy missile defenses “as a starting point for fielding improved and expanded missile defenses later.”

This, he said, “would indicate to the Russians that the current defense deployment in Europe is only the leading edge of a much larger and more capable future deployment.”

The Same Thing Under Obama

Since Freeman’s report appeared, Dr. Postol has continued to educate the public on the twofold danger: alarming our NATO allies with a system that does not work as promised, and alarming Russia with a system that is a potential threat to its national security.

In a May 2010 article for the Arms Control Association, “A Flawed and Dangerous U.S. Missile Defense Plan,” co-authored with George N. Lewis, Postol warned that the Obama Administration, while changing some features of the Bush BMD policy, has replaced it with a “new vision” that is “nothing more than a fiction and . . . could well lead to a foreign policy disaster.”

“The United States could damage its relations with allies and friends by pushing on them false and unreliable solutions to real security problems. It will antagonize Russia and China with massive defense deployments that have the appearance of being designed to be flexibly adaptable to deal with Russian and Chinese strategic forces.”

The authors concluded: “This new missile defense program could then lead to the usual results: gigantically expensive systems that have little real capability but create uncertainties that cause other states to react in ways that are not in the security interest of the United States.”

Such as nuclear war?