

The Doom of NATO?

“The unforgivable crime is soft hitting. Do not hit at all if it can be avoided, but NEVER hit softly. Never.” –President Theodore Roosevelt

Economic Sanctions Ineffectual

Russia has invaded Ukraine. President Biden and European NATO’s response is to levy economic sanctions carefully calibrated to hurt Russian banks and some of Moscow’s billionaire elites, but not so severe as to “destabilize” Russia’s society or government.

Thus, President Biden’s answer to Russian tanks, and to the greatest military threat to Europe since World War II, is the “soft hitting” of economic sanctions.

Economic sanctions have failed so often that thinking persons and tyrannical governments by now recognize them as a form of “Phoney War” or “political theater” by a weak and frightened West to project pretended strength.

Economic Sanctions are Dangerous

In fact, economic sanctions are a “green light” for aggressors:

- The threat of unprecedented severe economic sanctions has not deterred Russia from rolling tanks over Ukraine.
- Economic sanctions did not prevent Russia from annexing Crimea.
- Economic sanctions have not deterred China from economic warfare, stealing U.S. technology, and cyber-attacks against the U.S. Government.
- Economic sanctions have not prevented North Korea from developing and successfully testing A-bombs, H-bombs, and ICBMs that can strike any city in the U.S.
- Economic sanctions have not stopped Iran from developing an “Islamic Bomb” and long-range missiles.
- Economic sanctions provoked Japan to attack Pearl Harbor and start World War II against America.

Economic sanctions are not merely ineffective, but are provocative to military dictatorships that respect only military strength.

From the perspective of Moscow, Beijing, Pyongyang, and Tehran—as from the perspective of Imperial Japan in World War II—economic sanctions in response to military aggression are a sign of cowardice, moral bankruptcy, and appeasement verging on surrender.

Ukraine Crisis Could Become World War III

Now that Russia’s invasion of Ukraine has begun, President Biden should do nothing that gives Moscow an excuse to make a bigger war against NATO.

The President of the Center for Security Policy, Frank Gaffney, is right to warn that President Biden and NATO's irresolution and weakness is "repeating history" and brought us to the verge of World War III:

"Similarities between Adolf Hitler's actions and Putin's recent conduct are striking. An Anschluss like the Nazis' uncontested occupation of Austria has lately happened in Belarus. Putin has reprised the Third Reich's brazen seizure of Czechoslovakia's German-populated Sudetenland, in the name of ethnic solidarity, with his operations in Ukraine's Crimea and Donbass regions."

Moreover:

"Vladimir Putin now probably calculates that, like Hitler, he can finish the dismembering of the country he's targeted. The Western response again has been too little, too late. And, most worrying, like Hitler, he has a powerful partner in such crimes. His Stalin is another ruthless Communist: China's Xi Jinping. Brace for impact."

Biden's Ukraine Policy Invites Invasion of NATO

President Biden's plan to punish Russia by arming Ukraine, to turn Ukraine into a new Afghanistan by feeding arms from neighboring NATO states into Ukraine in hopes of a long bloody war for Russia, is most likely to backfire catastrophically.

Even with the recent flood of NATO arms to Ukraine, the U.S. Defense Department rightly estimates that Russia can crush Ukraine's army in days.

One significant metric is that the Ukrainian Air Force has only 70 jet fighters that have conducted recently only one major air exercise in two years— versus 1,900 Russian jet fighters of more modern vintage that exercise frequently.

President Biden's support of the Ukrainian armed forces, and then of a protracted guerilla insurgency from neighboring NATO states (Poland, Hungary, Romania, Czech Republic, and Slovakia) is an invitation for Russia to isolate Ukraine by invading NATO. The U.S. and its allies cannot project enough military power to defend the frontline NATO states in Eastern Europe.

Biden's "Tripwire" Risks Nuclear War

Recently, during the build-up to Russia's anticipated invasion of Ukraine, the U.S. and West European allies have moved thousands of troops into East European NATO. But the whole amounts to merely about 10,000 soldiers and a dozen jet fighters, hopelessly outnumbered by the 190,000 Russians invading Ukraine, and by the rest of the Russian Army, numbering over one million, that could quickly follow.

The very thin U.S. military presence in East European NATO is intended as a "nuclear tripwire" to deter Russia from invading NATO with the threat of U.S. nuclear escalation. The U.S. recently raised the nuclear stakes by flying a few B-52 strategic nuclear bombers to Britain and then, for the first time ever, to Poland.

But how credible is the U.S. nuclear deterrent under President Biden, who recently declared, “A nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought” and is contemplating adopting a nuclear “No First Use” pledge? The Biden Administration is so close to formally adopting a policy to never use nuclear weapons first that the State Department made secret inquiries of NATO and other allies for their opinions, who were aghast that they might lose the U.S. “nuclear umbrella.”

Should nuclear employment become necessary, if President Biden does not use tactical nuclear weapons first, he will never have any opportunity to use them second.

Russian Nuclear Superiority

U.S. tactical nuclear weapons number 180 aged gravity bombs stored in bunkers located in Germany, the Benelux countries, Italy, and Turkey. These are vastly outnumbered and outclassed in modernity by Russia’s variously estimated 2,000-8,000 tactical nuclear weapons.

Moreover, Russian nuclear warheads are more technologically advanced: designed for ultra-low-yields for use by land, sea, and air forces; specialized effects like neutrons, x-rays, and electromagnetic pulse (EMP); and “clean” so they produce no radioactive fallout. Russian nuclear weapons are not only a deterrent, but militarily practical for use on the battlefield.

The U.S. Intelligence Community knows about Russia’s development of advanced technology nuclear weapons. But they have failed to adequately warn policymakers and the public, or to fully appreciate and divulge the magnitude of the threat, as evidenced by these examples of heavily redacted CIA reports on Russia’s new generation nuclear weapons from 20 years ago:

--CIA, *Evidence of Russian Development of New Subkiloton Nuclear Warheads* (20 August 2000) SECRET now DECLASSIFIED.

--CIA, *Russia Developing New Nuclear Warheads at Novaya Zemlya?* (2 July 1999) SECRET now DECLASSIFIED.

--CIA, *Mikhaylov Pressing For Hydronuclear Experiments* (4 May 1999) TOP SECRET now DECLASSIFIED.

--CIA, *CLASSIFIED TITLE* DocId 1260486 (22 June 2000) SECRET now DECLASSIFIED.

Russia recently conducted nuclear forces exercises to warn Washington that Moscow will strike first—and prevail—if NATO resorts to nuclear escalation.

Russian Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack

Russia could win World War III in Europe with a single Super-EMP nuclear warhead.

Detonated 70 kilometers high over NATO Headquarters in Brussels, the EMP field would blackout electric grids and paralyze NATO military forces from Poland to Britain, making a red carpet for Russian invasion. U.S. troops and 30,000 civilians fleeing Ukraine would become POWs. Russian tanks could reach the English Channel in days.

After an EMP attack, the U.S. would discover it has no tactical nuclear weapons. Even if some delivery systems survive the EMP, it is highly unlikely any host European government would allow a tactical nuclear strike against Russia from its territory, fearing nuclear retaliation.

The small British and French nuclear deterrents could also be paralyzed by a Russian nuclear EMP attack, including severing their C3 to missile submarines at sea.

However, Western political-military leaders and peoples are indoctrinated to be so fearful of nuclear weapons that it is highly unlikely any Western government would use them, except as retribution for Russian nuclear blasting of cities.

Russia also has vast advantages over NATO in capabilities for Biological, Chemical, and Cyber Warfare.

Russian Superiority in Conventional Forces

Russia has the military muscle to win a conventional war against European NATO without resort to nuclear, biological, chemical, or cyber weapons. Russia has 20,000 main battle tanks (MBTs), 1,900 jet fighters, and over one million soldiers.

NATO is a shadow of what it was during the Cold War and has become hollowed-out militarily.

In 1989 the U.S. had 5,000 main battle tanks in Germany. President Obama withdrew all U.S. MBTs from Europe reducing the number to zero. President Trump started returning MBTs, but too little too late, so today there are only about 100 U.S. main battle tanks in Europe, to fight Russia's 20,000 tanks.

On their invasion route to the English Channel, the Russian Army's 20,000 tanks would encounter 219 MBTs in Poland, 245 MBTs in Germany, 406 MBTs in France, 0 MBTs in Belgium, 18 MBTs in the Netherlands, 44 MBTs in Denmark, and 227 MBTs from Britain, if London is courageous enough to risk another Dunkirk defending Europe. NATO's collective 1,159 MBTs are outnumbered by nearly 20-to-1.

West European NATO has never exercised, and do not have the capability to, rapidly project their collective land forces to defend Eastern Europe or Germany. They are essentially territorial armies that a Russian invasion would encounter in "penny packets" and easily overwhelm.

Russia has about 1,900 jet fighters to attack the collective air forces of the above NATO Europe countries, that can muster altogether 463 fighters, assuming many or most of these are not destroyed by Russian surprise missile and air attacks.

But would Germany, Britain, the Benelux countries, and France send their air forces to the defense of Poland, or each other, and risk Russian retaliation? NATO's theory of collective security has never been tested in a major war.

Globalism Will Lose To Nationalism

NATO's weakness is a consequence of European socialist-democratic governments building welfare states at the expense of military strength. NATO's elites wrongly equate nationalism

with Fascism, embrace Globalism, and look to supranational institutions like NATO, the United Nations, and International Law, backed by the U.S. “Global Policeman” to keep them safe.

But Globalism does not build strong armies. Nationalism builds strong armies.

Nationalism has been so abandoned by most NATO elites that Western Europe will not defend its borders even against unarmed illegal immigrants invading from the Middle East to transform their cultures and prey upon their citizens.

The new NATO Europe that has surrendered so easily to Syrian illegal refugees will not likely fight long and hard against Russian tanks.

If Russia’s invasion of Ukraine stays in Ukraine, do not expect the U.S. and European NATO to shed their Globalist ideals that are the cause of Western military weakness.

In the military contest between Western Globalism and Russian and Chinese Nationalism, Nationalism wins.

*Dr. Peter Vincent Pry is Executive Director of the Task Force on National and Homeland Security, served as Chief of Staff of the Congressional EMP Commission, Director of the U.S. Nuclear Strategy Forum, and on the staffs of the Congressional Strategic Posture Commission, the House Armed Services Committee, and the CIA. He is author of the books **Will America Be Protected?** (2022), **Blackout Warfare** (2021), and **The Power And The Light** (2020).*