


The Plan to Inflict *Unacceptable Damage* on a European Country

by Jeremy James



Mail Online graphic, 4 June, showing how NATO intends to bring US troops to the Russian front line

There is not much point in writing a paper if it begins with a warning to proceed no further. However, many of our readers have studied the terrible events described in the Book of Revelation and know they will come to pass. They are spiritually prepared. For others, alas, this paper may be a real challenge.

In 1992 Russia issued a document setting out the broad strategy it would follow when deploying its armed forces in a time of war. The purpose of this document was to apprise potential enemies of the steps it would take to defend itself against attack. In doing so the Russian government was not revealing any militarily sensitive information but allowing the world to see how it would respond to escalating threats by an aggressor.

History has shown that many unfortunate decisions have been based on a serious misreading of another nation's strategic intentions. A document of this kind is designed to improve communication and make it more difficult for a conflict to commence. As such it should be seen as a military deterrent.


The Russian document has been updated a few times since 1992, with no significant changes before 2020. The intended audience – the US and NATO member states – was expected to study it carefully and to take seriously the strategy that Russia has been following, both in its preparations for any future war and in relation to the methods it would use in the conduct of such a war.

The document thus constitutes a statement of the military doctrine being followed by the Russian high command and cannot be treated lightly by foreign powers.

The updated version of 2020

On 2 June 2020, Vladimir Putin, the Russian president, signed a decree [No. 355] which made some changes to the doctrine, which was last updated in 2014. It was called *Foundations of State Policy of the Russian Federation in the Area of Nuclear Deterrence* and came into force before the Russian attack on the Ukraine.

These various updates are welcomed by NATO since they help to clarify what exactly Russia might do if a conflict arose in circumstances where an explosive nuclear device might conceivably be deployed. Western observers believe that Russia provides these additional details from time to time to impress upon NATO its determination to do exactly as it says in its Military Doctrine. Apparently some NATO members have been suggesting that certain aspects of the doctrine were a bluff and that its provisions should not be taken at face value. The Russians appear to be concerned that this attitude would undermine its deterrent effect.



As we stated in previous papers, we do not believe that explosive nuclear devices actually exist. However, the destructive power of modern ballistic missiles and thermobaric bombs is immense. For this reason we may refer instead to a nuclear strike as a massive ballistic attack (MBA). An MBA on a city could easily be represented in the media as a nuclear strike. The images broadcast in news reports could even be produced by CGI and AI to enhance the impression that a single explosive device had been used and that deadly radiation fall-out could be expected.

A critical change in the Russian military doctrine

The Military Doctrine of 2014 differentiated between levels of military conflict, giving rise to the impression that Russia might not deploy a nuclear device in a lower level conflict, even if it was facing defeat. Crucially, the 2020 version does NOT differentiate between levels of conflict. This implies that the Kremlin might decide to use a nuclear device to prevent a regional conflict escalating into something more serious that *could* threaten Russian sovereignty.

The 2020 decree also makes it clear that Russia will resort to the nuclear option only if it is attacked or facing an imminent attack. The purpose of the nuclear option is to inflict so much damage on the aggressor that, even if it defeated Russia, the cost of victory would be much too high. This means the credibility of its nuclear capability is central to the deterrent effect of its Military Doctrine:

Excerpt from the 2020 document

4. State policy on Nuclear Deterrence is defensive by nature. It is aimed at maintaining the nuclear forces potential at the level sufficient for nuclear deterrence, and guarantees protection of national sovereignty and territorial integrity of the State and deterrence of a potential adversary from aggression against the Russian Federation and/or its allies.

A major difference between the 2014 doctrine and that of 2020 is that the former spoke of the infliction of “commensurate” or “tailored” damage on an enemy if attacked, while the latter speaks of “unacceptable damage.” The absence of a graduated or tailored response is highly significant. As drafted, the decree seems to imply that, under certain circumstances, Russia reserves the right to retaliate with overwhelming force to an attack which, in earlier versions of its Military Doctrine, would have received a more measured response:

Excerpt from the 2020 document

10. Nuclear deterrence is ensured by the presence in the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation of the combat-ready forces and means that are capable of inflicting guaranteed unacceptable damage on a potential adversary through employment of nuclear weapons in any circumstances, as well as by the readiness and resolve of the Russian Federation to use such weapons.

The underlined passage says it all. In fact, it says more than most Western journalists appear to realize. If we break it down into its component elements we will see that it poses a terrible threat to European members of NATO:

(a) ***guaranteed unacceptable damage***

Through the inclusion of the word “guaranteed” we can see that they are referring here to a hammer blow, not a slow-moving military campaign. This can only mean the use of a deadly weapon capable of killing a very large number of people or causing immense infrastructural damage.

(b) ***potential adversary***

The inclusion of the word “potential” is chilling. They are referring, not to an actual aggressor, but to a foreign power which they believe is planning to launch an attack. The perception that a foreign power poses an imminent threat to Russia’s territorial integrity is deemed sufficient grounds for inflicting “unacceptable damage”.

(c) ***employment of nuclear weapons***

Incredibly the Doctrine specifically states that a nuclear weapon will be used to inflict “unacceptable damage”.

(d) ***in any circumstances***

This term appears to mean that Russia will use its “deterrent” in a way that fits its own perception of what is required.

The perceived threats that could trigger a nuclear response

The Doctrine goes on to describe the types of threat that could trigger such a response. We give below the complete text of the *Military Doctrine* regarding these threats:

12. The main military risks that might evolve into military threats (threats of aggression) to the Russian Federation due to changes in the military-political and strategic situation, and that are to be neutralized by implementation of nuclear deterrence, are as follows:

(a) build-up by a potential adversary of the general purpose forces groupings that possess nuclear weapons delivery means in the territories of the states contiguous with the Russian Federation and its allies, as well as in adjacent waters;

(b) deployment by states which consider the Russian Federation as a potential adversary, of missile defence systems and means, medium- and shorter-range cruise and ballistic missiles, non-nuclear high-precision and hypersonic weapons, strike unmanned aerial vehicles, and directed energy weapons;

(c) development and deployment of missile defense assets and strike systems in outer space;

(d) possession by states of nuclear weapons and (or) other types of weapons of mass destruction that can be used against the Russian Federation and/or its allies, as well as means of delivery of such weapons;

(e) uncontrolled proliferation of nuclear weapons, their delivery means, technology and equipment for their manufacture;

(f) deployment of nuclear weapons and their delivery means in the territories of non-nuclear weapon states.

Several of these perceived threats have already been activated by the US and NATO!

These include:

The supply of funds, weapons and military expertise to the Ukraine;

The supply of nuclear-capable F16 fighter jets to the Ukraine;

The repeated call by certain NATO members to commence military operations against Russia;

The supply of French troops to support the Ukrainian army on the field of battle;

The US approval of direct operations by the Ukraine inside Russia;

The admission of new NATO members in close proximity to Russia, notably Finland;

The positioning of NATO troops, aircraft and artillery close to the Russian border.

There is also another threat which is so provocative and so outrageous – the Ukrainian strikes on strategic radar bases inside Russia – that we need to examine it separately.

MIT expert warns of an *extremely alarming new development*

In the past few days, a professor emeritus in MIT's program in science, technology and international security, Dr Theodore Postol, has been sending the following email to national security reporters at major U.S. publications. As you read what he says, please bear in mind that, as one of the leading experts in the U.S. on the Russian nuclear defense capability, he is likely to know what he's talking about:

Subject: EXTREMELY ALARMING NEW DEVELOPMENT – Ukrainians Attack A SECOND Russian Nuclear Strategic Early Warning Radar

Dear _____,

I am writing to alert you to an extremely alarming new development that poses a direct and immediate threat to the security of the United States.

The Ukrainians have now attacked a second critical Russian nuclear strategic early warning radar at Orsk.

This radar looks towards the Indian Ocean and has some overlap with the radar fans from the already damaged radar at Armavir.

The initial indicators are that the amount of damage to the Orsk is likely limited, but it cannot be ruled out that the radar is not functioning for the moment due to the attack.

This is a very serious situation.

Unlike the United States, the Russians do not have space-based satellite warning systems that can see ballistic missile attacks globally. This means that the radar coverage lost by the attacks on these radars greatly reduces the warning time against attacks on Moscow from the Mediterranean and Indian oceans.

The Russians have a radar operating in Moscow that can see arriving warheads but they would only begin to see the warheads above the horizon at very short times before impacts.

My estimates (based on real analysis, not BS) is that the radar early warning time has been reduced from about 15 to 16 minutes to about 10 to 11.

This amount of warning time might quite possibly eliminate the possibility of any deliberation-time on the part of Russian leaders if they were confronted with a decision of whether or not to launch Russian strategic nuclear forces in response to a nuclear attack on Moscow.

Russian political leadership in Moscow would have almost no time to assess the situation if they believed a possible attack from the south was underway.

The extreme time-pressure on Russian leadership could thereby significantly increase the possibilities of a catastrophic nuclear accident.

The fact that Blinken and his national security team have provided a “go ahead” to the Ukrainian government to attack Russian sites outside of Ukraine, means that Blinken has recklessly told Ukrainians they can engage in such acts that would have a potentially catastrophic consequence for the United States, and the entire planet.

If Blinken is not aware of the danger that is posed by these attacks, he is so incompetent that he should be removed along with his entire team from any position of authority.


If he is aware of this danger, he should also be removed with his entire national security team.

I have extensive personal experiences with people at the White House that indicate to me it is entirely possible that Blinken and his team are not aware of the dangers they are...allowing to occur.

I will not spend time herein describing my personal experiences and observations, but I can do so at any time on any notice. It cannot be ruled out that the White House is completely unaware of the danger.

Please feel free to give me a call at any time if you would like to hear further about my concerns.

I cannot emphasize enough how frightening and dangerous this development is – at least to me, who I think can claim a rather detailed knowledge of the nuclear strike systems of both Russia and [the] United States.



Attacks on Russian Radar Defense System

Initially Ukrainian sources claimed that the drones launched targeting Armavir were HUR type, that is, Ukrainian built. However, the Russians have recovered partially destroyed drones that are not local, Ukrainian products. The recovered drones are Portuguese-made Tekever AR3 drones. Portugal announced it was supplying these drones last June after the UK agreed to pay for them. The fact that NATO equipment was used in the attack is deeply concerning should the Russians decide to retaliate... The Ukrainian attack represents the first time that strategic nuclear defense installations have been attacked in Russia or any other country. There has long been a debate among defense experts on the issue of “launch on warning.” Had the Russians believed this was a NATO attack on their nuclear facilities, [it] could have triggered a nuclear response.

Asia Times, 29 May 2024

<https://asiatimes.com/2024/05/attack-on-russian-radar-is-a-significant-escalation/>

Some commentators have noted that, given the distance covered by the drones which struck the three radar sites – over 1,100 miles inside Russian territory – and the way they evaded Russian defense capabilities, they could only have been the advanced type used by NATO. The Ukrainians may also have needed the services of NATO personnel to guide the drones to their intended targets. The *Asia Times* (see insert) reported that the drones were provided by NATO and financed by the UK.

Loud Russian warnings to NATO, the US and the West

On 29 May President Putin said that "constant escalation can lead to serious consequences. If these serious consequences occur in Europe, how will the United States behave, bearing in mind our parity in the field of strategic weapons?" Sergei Ryabkov, the Russian deputy foreign minister, added that this was a “very significant warning... and must be taken with the utmost seriousness.”

A few days later, on 2 June, Putin warned that the West could face “fatal consequences” if the Ukraine continued to ignore his warnings that it not use weapons provided by NATO members. Ryabkov added: “I would like to warn American leaders against miscalculations that could have fatal consequences. For unknown reasons, they underestimate the seriousness of the rebuff they may receive.”

The “rebuff” to which Ryabkov refers is the firm intention by the Kremlin to inflict “unacceptable damage” on a Western country if their warnings continue to be ignored. They have in mind in particular the approval that Washington has given to the Ukraine to conduct long-range strikes inside Russia.

The Russian leadership has moved far beyond the language of international diplomacy. They are telling the West in no uncertain terms that this foreign interference has got to stop because, if it doesn’t, they will definitely deliver a fatal blow to West. They want Western leaders to understand that they are not bluffing and that they will do exactly as they have stated in their Military Doctrine of 2020.



Mail Online graphic, 23 January 2024. Sweden has since joined NATO.

“The words of his mouth were smoother than butter, but war was in his heart: his words were softer than oil, yet were they drawn swords.”

Psalm 55:21

CONCLUSION

Never in the history of international diplomacy has any country with significant military capability threatened another country or group of countries in this way. The threat to inflict “unacceptable damage” is reinforced by the inclusion of such a threat in a high level policy document and a statement of the circumstances that would trigger such a response. There will be no warning prior to execution of this threat, other than those already made by the Kremlin leadership in recent weeks.

The Biden administration is deliberately provoking the Russians. The hawks in Washington want this conflict to escalate to the point where “nuclear” weapons are deployed and Massive Ballistic Attacks are conducted. This is why Washington is permitting the Ukrainian regime to carry out long-range strikes inside Russia, even to the point of destroying radar sites that are critical to the integrity of the Russian nuclear defense system.

Why would Washington want to do something like this? We have given the answer in several of our previous papers. The proposed ‘New World Order’ will be built, as planned, on the ruins of the old order. The ultra-rich Elite who control every country on earth, including Russia, China, Iran and North Korea, have carefully prepared the world stage for this calamitous military conflict, just as they planned and financed World Wars I and II. The Russian “response” would appear to be the dramatic flashpoint event that will set it all in motion.

Luciferian banking families planned and financed -	Luciferian banking families planned and financed -	Luciferian banking families planned and financed -
WORLD WAR I	WORLD WAR II	WORLD WAR III

A nuclear explosion in a European city would be many times more shocking than 9/11. The seismic repercussions would bring the Western financial system to its knees. Emergency civil control measures, if not full-blown martial-law, would be instituted across Europe and elsewhere. The basic necessities of life would be in short supply and governments everywhere would impose rationing and strict controls over resources. Freedom of speech and basic civil rights would also be severely restricted for ‘security’ reasons.

The Russian deputy foreign minister stated that the Russian response would be “asymmetrical”. This leaves open the possibility that it would choose a course which inflicted “unacceptable damage” by some means other than a nuclear weapon. A massive cyber attack on banking, financial and infrastructural targets in several NATO member states would be immensely painful and might be enough to satisfy the Russian desire to make a “statement”. The nuclear option might only come into play if their “statement” is ignored.

Betrayal

The populations of all Western countries have been betrayed by their leaders. With the sharp decline in true Christianity since 1945, most people no longer possess a moral compass. They have no way to assess the gravity of the lies being told to them by their governments and no common understanding of the issues at stake. The Luciferians have exploited this abysmal decline in spiritual discernment to put in place a system of mind control which has blinded the masses and induced a state of complacency that would have been unthinkable fifty years ago.

The governments of the US, the UK, France, Germany, Russia, China and the rest are working for Satan. They are implementing his plan and carrying out his orders. They will do whatever is needed to frighten the population of the world into submission and make them receptive to the beguiling message of the Antichrist when he arrives on the scene to 'restore order' and 'heal' mankind.

“When the wicked, even mine enemies and my foes, came upon me to eat up my flesh, they stumbled and fell. Though an host should encamp against me, my heart shall not fear: though war should rise against me, in this will I be confident.” – Psalm 27:2-3

**Jeremy James
Ireland
June 6, 2024**

- SPECIAL REQUEST -

Time is running out...

Regular readers are encouraged to download the papers on this website for safekeeping and future reference. They may not always be available.

For an easy way to download all papers (over 380), please email me.

We are rapidly moving into an era where material of this kind may be obtained only via email. Ireland is on the brink of introducing a draconian censorship law which will shut down sites like this and could result in penalties such as confiscation of property, financial fines and imprisonment for up to five years.

Readers who wish to be included on a future mailing list are welcome to contact me at the following address:-

jeremypauljames@gmail.com

For further information visit www.zephaniah.eu

Copyright Jeremy James 2024