

## Stop Star Wars

### Bulletin no. 3, May 2001

Whichever political party wins the general election, the next British Government will have to decide whether to allow the US to use early warning facilities at RAF Fylingdales and RAF Menwith Hill as part of a Star Wars system. Without the use of these bases the US cannot proceed with the dangerous and destabilising Star Wars programme.

A decision to allow the use of US bases in the UK will have a profoundly negative impact on the future of international security, and will make the UK a target for attack (see Sir Timothy Garden's comments during Danish parliamentary hearing, summarised here.)

Yet, if Alistair Campbell is to be believed, the current Government believes that Star Wars is "broadly a good idea". William Hague has already committed a future Conservative Government to full support for whatever President Bush asks for.

Both Tony Blair and William Hague seem to be paying little attention to the recommendations of the Select Committee on Foreign Affairs who were "not convinced that the US plans to deploy NMD represent an appropriate response to the proliferation problems faced by the international community."

Of the three major parties only the Liberal Democrats have openly questioned the logic of the US proceeding with a Star Wars programme and the UK's support for it.

59 MPs have now signed EDM 469 on National Missile Defence, calling on Her Majesty's Government "to have a full parliamentary debate on the implications of involving Fylingdales in the NMD programme". EDM 650, which "endorses the unanimous conclusion of the Foreign Affairs Select Committee which recommended that the Government voice the grave doubts about NMD in the UK" now has 106 signatories.

This edition of the Stop Star Wars Bulletin highlights recent UK polling that both Labour and Liberal Democrat supporters are overwhelmingly opposed to Star Wars. It also highlights some of the international reaction to President Bush's May 1<sup>st</sup> speech, recent presentations to the Danish Parliament and the growing opposition of congressional Democrats within the US to Star Wars. Developments in the US congress suggest that it is not, as some have suggested, inevitable that the US will proceed with NMD. Star Wars can be stopped and the UK must do all it can to play a role in stopping it.

- Labour and Liberal Democrat Voters Oppose Star Wars
- Greenpeace Activists Arrested in Protest at Star Wars Test Site
- Denmark Debates Star Wars
- US Democrats Prepare to Obstruct Star Wars
- International Reaction to Bush Speech
- "Size doesn't matter", Richard Norton-Taylor, *Guardian*
- "So just how safe is the nuclear shield", by Peter Beaumont, Ed Vulliamy and Paul Beaver, *Observer*
- "Restarting The Nuclear Race", by Richard Butler, Op-Ed, *New York Times*

## **Labour and Liberal Democrat Voters Overwhelmingly Opposed to Star Wars**

69% percent of Labour supporters polled are opposed to the deployment of the US missile defence project.

The poll, of 2,166 people, conducted by YouGov.com for Greenpeace between 23-24 February 2001, also found that 72% of Liberal Democrat supporters either oppose or strongly oppose the Star Wars programme. In strong contrast, 80% of Conservative voters support Star Wars development.

The major concern about the Star Wars project expressed by those polled was that it will ignite a new arms race, which concerned 73% of Labour supporters, 71% of Liberal Democrat supporters and 41% of Conservative supporters.

## **Greenpeace Activists Arrested in Protest at Star Wars Test Site**

Two Greenpeace activists were arrested on Monday 7 May at the US missile test range at Kwajalein in the Pacific Marshall Islands. The activists were protesting against President Bush's missile defence programme, on the first day of a US diplomatic 'charm offensive' to sell the idea to the UK and other countries.

The two protestors, one from the UK, one from Denmark, carried a banner saying "Just Say No" on to the US base before being arrested at the site of an X-band radar used in Star Wars missile tests.

Kwajalein Atoll is at the heart of the Star Wars testing programme. It is from there that the US test-fires the missile intended to intercept a simulated incoming missile that has been fired from the Vandenberg Air Force Base in California.

The activists involved have been sentenced to one month in prison, three weeks of which are suspended.

## Denmark Debates Star Wars

The Danish Parliament in Copenhagen held a full debate on US plans for Star Wars on Thursday 3 May, following a Foreign Policy Committee Conference on National Missile Defence: Implications for the Global Order.

Like Britain, the Danish Government must give its consent if the US is to upgrade radar facilities as part of its Star Wars plans. An upgrade of the early warning radar at Thule Air Force Base in north-west Greenland is critical to current US missile defence plans. Thule is part of a network of five early warning radar bases, including RAF Fylingdales in Yorkshire.

Prior to the debate, Danish Foreign Policy Committee hearings addressed the risk of an arms race in space as China responds to US missile defence plans, the reliability of US threat assessments, and the US State Department's assumption that the British and Danish Government will sanction the use of Fylingdales, Menwith Hill and Thule.

### Excerpts from the Danish Foreign Policy Committee Conference hearings, 25 April 2001

*Sir Timothy Garden, King's College London*

#### **Involvement of Denmark and Britain**

"Almost certainly any proposed system would seek to upgrade the Danish and UK radars to X-Band. There might also be proposals for forward deployments of missiles."

#### **Scepticism about technical feasibility**

"There is a high degree of scepticism among the UK defence scientific establishment about the technical feasibility of wide area missile defence."

#### **Encourages nuclear arms race**

"...The potential deployment of an NMD system, whether it works or not, may have a negative security effect on China, the Indian sub-continent and Russia. The interaction between the nuclear players could reduce the incentives for arms control, and push each towards increasing its fielded nuclear capability... Nor does NMD seem to offer any prospect to the world of a change in the drivers for proliferation. Indeed, it could be argued that it will encourage the development of less traditional methods of delivery for WMD [weapons of mass destruction] systems."

#### **Tackling the problem of proliferation**

"... There is a different perspective on how to tackle the limited problem of proliferating states. The international community has had some success in reducing the number of potential nuclear weapons states over the years, and Europeans believe that the process should continue. In particular the NPT should be the vehicle for progress in this field."

### **Upgrades to Thule, Fylingdales and Menwith Hill break the ABM treaty**

"While neither the UK nor Denmark are signatories of the bilateral ABM treaty, they have an interest in its observation and continuance. The necessary upgrades to Thule, Fylingdales and Menwith Hill are not permitted under the current ABM treaty."

### **Fylingdales and Thule would become targets**

"The upgraded X-band radar sites would become the forward eyes of an NMD system. They would therefore become the priority targets for any enemy which wished to penetrate a US NMD system."

*John Steinbruner, University of Maryland*

### **Impact on International Law**

"[Missile defence] ... itself will have immediate consequences – especially serious ones if the ABM treaty is abrogated at the outset, as the Bush Administration is apparently contemplating. In my judgement that action would constitute such a stark assault on the entire legal structure of international security that it would bring virtually all existing arrangements into question."

### **Missile Defence is supplement to US offensive capability**

"...The clear implication is that the American missile defence program is not intended to operate independently but rather as a supplement to pre-emptive attacks by United States offensive forces. The offensive capacity of the United States, both nuclear and conventional, is already quite imposing and is being continuously improved in qualitative terms. Voluntary reductions in the nuclear weapons component to the level of 1500 warheads are apparently being discussed by the Bush administration, but those provisions would not remove or even fundamentally alter the pre-emptive potential of the United States."

*Ambassador Yuriy Kapralov, Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs*

### **Missile Defence undermines strategic stability and arms control**

"By building a 'nuclear shield' while simultaneously keeping a substantial strategic offensive nuclear capability, the United States would drastically change the equation and... would undermine strategic stability."

"It is highly indicative that while the deployment of such a missile defence has not even started, the plans for such defence for the US territory already now adversely affect arms control..."

### **Increased risk of serious accidents and use of nuclear weapons**

"The deployment of the US territorial missile defence would result in undermining strategic stability and in a sharp increase of uncertainty and unpredictability. For the military it would mean heightened alert and readiness... for a civilian population it would mean a much greater risk of serious accidents and use of nuclear weapons."

### **Triggering a new arms race**

"On the part of other nuclear powers historically engaged in competition with the US a natural response would be measures to offset the unilateral advantage of deploying strategic missile defences, to ensure survival after a [nuclear] first strike, to prepare to overcome or disable the missile defences of the United States. That means 'good-bye' to radical reductions and research and development restraint, 'welcome' to new arms race, to an accelerated development of new technologies and techniques, to make the defended territory vulnerable again and retain deterrence at all costs."

### **Democrats Prepare to Obstruct Star Wars**

Democrats in the US Senate and the House of Representatives have denounced Bush's plans for Star Wars, warning that unilateral deployment of a missile defence system could leave the United States less secure by sparking a new arms race. According to Senator Carl Levin, the most senior Democrat on the Senate Armed Services Committee, Democrats in the Senate will now "try in some way to stop the expenditure of funds for a system that would abrogate the ABM treaty." (*New York Times*, 3 May). Consequently, claims that NMD deployment are inevitable are clearly premature.

House Democratic Leader Richard A. Gephardt: "I am concerned that the President's approach to strategic nuclear and missile defence policy may have the effect of undermining our nation's security rather than enhancing it.

"...Initial reactions from our allies and other nations suggest that this approach is likely to increase threats to the U.S. and decrease global stability, as exhibited by the likely consequences: Russia's preservation and China's construction of large stocks of nuclear weapons to counter U.S. missile defences; an end to transparency and verification of other nations' nuclear arsenals, which has preserved strategic stability and advanced U.S. interests; and the continued proliferation of weapons of mass destruction as other nations follow America's lead in taking unilateral steps that may serve their own immediate interests." (Office of Senator Richard Gephardt, 1 May)

Senate Democratic Leader Thomas Daschle: "We've got to ask some very tough questions: first about whether or not this system will ever work; secondly, whether or not it's worth abrogating a treaty that has been longstanding, one supported by our allies and adversaries alike; and third, what kind of a relationship will we have with our allies if we violate the ABM Treaty and move ahead without adequate consultation with them?" (Comments to the Press, Office of Senator Thomas Daschle, 1 May)

Senator Joseph Biden, Ranking Democrat Foreign Relations Committee: "We should not head down the "Star Wars" road again. The fundamental question regarding a national missile defence system is whether it would make us more secure or less secure. We must decide if the investment of

tens of billions of dollars in what the Pentagon thinks is the least likely threat to our security - an ICBM attack by another nation – is appropriate, or whether we should defend ourselves against the threat of terrorists, who have the ability, for example, to inflict devastating damage by placing a "dirty atom bomb" in the hull of a ship in New York harbor." (Statement by Senator Joseph Biden on National Missile Defence, 2 May)

Senator Carl Levin, Ranking Democrat on Armed Services Committee: "If we proceed to deploy national missile defences unilaterally and in a manner other nations may find threatening, we risk a new Cold War, Cold War II. It could prompt Russia to keep nuclear weapons that they are ready to dismantle, and it could prompt China to deploy more nuclear weapons than it would otherwise build. Those greater numbers of nuclear weapons increase the risk of proliferation to nations and terrorist groups seeking to acquire nuclear material or nuclear weapons. These consequences could make the United States less secure rather than more secure..." (Levin Reaction to Bush Speech on National Missile Defence, Press Release, 2 May)

Senator Paul Wellstone, member Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "The most important question we must ask ourselves is whether a missile shield will make us more or less secure. I think it is likely to make us less secure by encouraging Russia to retain more nuclear weapons than it had planned, including ICBM's on hair-trigger alert, thereby increasing the risk of accidental war. Deployment of a missile shield will also spur China to build up its limited nuclear strategic arsenal, which in turn would fuel the nuclear arms race between India and Pakistan. These and other potential consequences of building NMD will make the U.S. less, not more secure." (Wellstone Criticizes Bush Missile Defence Plan, Press Release, 1 May)

Representative Tom Allen, Armed Services Committee: "The strategic policy announced by President Bush today, if implemented, will make the world less stable and undermine U.S. national security. Rushing deployment of national missile defence (NMD) will provoke other nations to increase their offensive arms." ("New era not here yet, say critics", *Washington Post*, 2 May)

Representative Neil Abercrombie, ranking Democrat on House Armed Services' research and development subcommittee: "Congress must guard against allowing missile defence systems becoming the policy, allowing the technology, in effect, to develop its own psychology. There is gradually being created in the United States a burgeoning military and corporate apparatus dependent in large measure on missile defence to rationalize its existence." ("Missile quotes from Bush", Associated Press, 2 May)

## International Reaction to Bush Speech

- **Spokesperson for UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan:** "These plans inevitably impact upon global security and strategic stability... The Secretary-General believes that, in promoting respect for the rule of law in international affairs, there is a need to consolidate and build upon existing disarmament and non-proliferation agreements, specifically to prevent a new arms race and to maintain the non-weaponised status of outer space. In this context, the Secretary-General appeals to all states to engage in negotiations towards legally-binding agreements that are both verifiable and irreversible." (UN Press Release SG/SM/7788, 1 May)
- **Canada, Foreign Minister John Manley:** "A unilateral abrogation of the ABM Treaty would be very problematic for us." ("Global reaction to missile plan is cautious", *New York Times*, 3 May)
- **China, Foreign Ministry spokesperson Zhu Bangzao:** "We believe the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty is the cornerstone for safeguarding global strategic balance and stability... If the treaty is destroyed...[this] balance and stability will be broken, and the international arms control process and non-proliferation efforts will be impeded..." ("China warns of arms race", Associated Press, 3 May)
- **Germany, Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer:** "An effective, treaty-based arms control and disarmament regime must be preserved and expanded, including effective and verifiable prevention of proliferation... To avoid a global or regional arms race a co-operative basis is necessary, which also brings in Russia and China..." ("Russia Calls for Missile Talks", CNN, 2 May)

"The ABM treaty worked well...We want control mechanisms that worked well in the past, should they be replaced, to be replaced only by better ones or more effective ones. We don't want there to be a new arms race." ("Daunting Hurdles For Missile Shield", *Los Angeles Times*, 3 May)
- **New Zealand, Foreign Minister Phil Goff and Disarmament Minister Matt Robson:** "...The establishment of the missile defence system runs the risk of halting and reversing multilateral progress towards the elimination of nuclear weapons." ("World Wary About Bush's Missile Defence Plan", Associated Press, 2 May)
- **Russia, Dmitry Rogozin, Chair, Duma Foreign Affairs Committee:** "If the United States actually goes through with its intention to abandon the 1972 treaty, that would destroy the entire security system we have today." ("Hostile response to missile defence plan", BBC web site, 2 May)
- **Sweden, Foreign Minister Anna Lindh:** "An American anti-missile defence system poses a risk for a new arms race. Countries like China, India or Pakistan could use it as an excuse to pursue their arms programs. It would be quite regrettable if President Bush were to declare the ABM treaty null and void without international

negotiation and checks." ("US missile shield could relaunch arms race", Agence France Presse, 2 May)

"We urge President Bush to abstain from the national missile defence, just as we urge China, India and Pakistan to discontinue their nuclear arsenals. ... This could spark a new arms race..." ("World Wary About Bush's Missile Defence plan", Associated Press, 2 May)

## **Recent press articles**

### **Size doesn't matter**

America has put nuclear weapons back on the agenda. Big or small, they're still dangerous

Richard Norton-Taylor, Guardian

Wednesday April 25, 2001

It is time we Europeans woke up to the fact, however uncomfortable it may be, that nuclear weapons are well and truly back on the agenda. A growing lobby of American political and military zealots, reawakened by President Bush's election success and egged on by leading scientists, want to attack "rogue" states with nuclear weapons.

Under proposals being considered by the US defence department, "mini-nukes" would attack dictators' underground headquarters and their supplies of chemical and biological weapons. Nukes would do what conventional bombs have conspicuously failed to achieve: knock out bunkers being built deeper and deeper into the rocks. User-friendly, "low-yield", nuclear weapons would limit collateral damage (ie killing civilians) and radioactive fall-out, argue their proponents.

"The US will undoubtedly require a new nuclear weapon... because it is realised that the yields of the weapons left over from the cold war are too high for addressing the deterrence requirements of a multipolar, widely proliferated world," Paul Robinson, director of America's Sandia Nuclear Laboratories pronounced recently. "Low-yield weapons with highly accurate delivery systems" would be a useful deterrent, he said, adding that such devices could help decision-makers "contemplate the destruction of some buried or hidden targets while being mindful of the need to minimise collateral damage".

In a paper entitled Nuclear Weapons in the 21st Century, Stephen Younger, head of nuclear weapons research at the Los Alamos laboratory, last year said low-yield nukes would be more effective against underground concrete bunkers and mobile missiles than conventional bombs. Weapons of less than five kilotons, the argument goes, would be a more credible deterrent than "normal" nuclear weapons. Indeed, they could have been used during the Kosovo war. And mini-nukes would



enable the US to reduce its stockpile of 6,000 much larger nuclear warheads.

The taboo, whereby nuclear weapons would not be used against non-nuclear powers as a war-fighting tool, was breached last year in an amendment to the US defence budget authorisation bill tabled by two republican senators, John Warner and Wayne Allard. This required the Pentagon to study how best to bomb buried targets, including the use of low-yield nuclear devices.

A 1994 law, the Federation of American Scientists points out in a recent report, prohibits nuclear laboratories in the US from undertaking research and development that could lead to a precision nuclear weapon of less than five kilotons because "low-yield nuclear weapons blur the distinction between nuclear and conventional war". However, it warns that legislation for long-term research and actual development of low-yield nuclear weapons will almost certainly be proposed in the new session of Congress.

The notion that an accurate, low-yield, nuclear bomb would cause limited - acceptable - collateral damage is ludicrous. As Martin Butcher and Theresa Hitchens, two security analysts, point out, a five-kiloton warhead dropped on London might only destroy Islington. But it would kill thousands of people and make thousands more victims of burns, radiation sickness, and blindness.

"The use of any nuclear weapon capable of destroying a buried target that is otherwise immune to conventional attack will necessarily produce enormous numbers of civilian casualties," the federation points out in its report. "No earth-burrowing missile can penetrate deep enough into the earth to contain an explosion with a nuclear yield even as small as 1% of the 15 kiloton Hiroshima weapon," it says. "The explosion simply blows out a massive crater of radioactive dirt, which rains down on the local region with an especially intense and deadly fallout."

The Pentagon is due to send its report on mini-nukes to Congress in July, the same time a separate and comprehensive review of US strategic nuclear deterrence is likely to be published. One thing is certain. As Paul Rogers, professor of peace studies at Bradford University, puts it: "Building new nuclear weapons is firmly on the agenda of the Bush administration."

Whether it involves the development of mini-nukes or a new version of the Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile system or a new Trident 3 system for nuclear submarines, it will lead to increasing pressure within the US to resume nuclear tests, a move which could destroy the comprehensive test ban treaty which Washington has yet to ratify.

This, coupled with the growing debate in the US about using nuclear weapons in limited or regional wars, has the most serious implications for nuclear proliferation and arms control treaties already threatened by the

Bush administration's determination to go ahead with a missile defence system.

There is talk now in the US about nuclear weapons in this project, too. Nuclear warheads, so the argument runs, would be most effective in knocking out incoming missiles. That's one more reason to worry.

### **So just how safe is the nuclear shield?**

Excerpt from article published in the Observer, 6<sup>th</sup> May, by Peter Beaumont, Ed Vulliamy and Paul Beaver...

"If... proof is needed of the new unilateralist mood in Washington, it is provided by evidence that the Bush administration is preparing to scale down - if not abandon - what many regard as the single most important global security programme: the co-operative effort between the US and Russia to slash the vast nuclear arsenal of the former USSR, and prevent proliferation of deadly nuclear materials.

The administration has already cut more than \$100 million from the \$874m spent on co-operation projects with Russia under the auspices of the Department of Energy. More ominously, it has put the programme at the core of the effort - the so called Nunn-Lugar Programme - 'under review'.

The project - which has survived all the ups and downs between Washington and Moscow - is named after the two senators who devised and direct the scheme, Republican Richard Lugar and retired Democrat Sam Nunn. It involves hundreds of US officials and contractees working at remote sites to neutralise every instrument of nuclear war.

It is due to run until 2007, and has already overseen the destruction of 5,336 warheads, 422 Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles, 367 silos, 425 cruise missiles and almost a fleet of fully equipped and armed nuclear submarines. It was under this programme that the Ukraine, Belarus and Kazakhstan gave up their nuclear arsenals.

The administration's potential threat to the programme has detonated the most serious rebellion against the Bush White House by any senior Republican on any issue. Last week Senator Lugar gave a thunderous speech at a private function warning: 'There are no programmes as critical to US security as those aimed at containing and dismantling the nuclear, chemical and biological warfare infrastructure of the former Soviet Union. The administration must ensure that these efforts are managed efficiently and funded properly'.

In the explosion of international anger that greeted Bush's speech, Britain, which has so long cast itself as America's closest ally, has been caught in the crossfire. Despite the encouraging noises of Tony Blair and his spokesman Alastair Campbell over British collaboration with the

programme, privately some senior officials and Ministers are deeply concerned..."

## **Restarting The Nuclear Race**

By Richard Butler, Op-Ed, *New York Times*, May 2, 2001

President Bush said yesterday that "we must move beyond the constraints of the 30-year-old ABM treaty" and establish defences against nuclear missiles. His proposals deserve close analysis, especially with respect to their likely effectiveness and costs...

Today's proponents of national missile defence argue that, because of the possible acquisition of long-range missiles by rogue states, it is necessary to develop new defensive measures even at the cost of scrapping the ABM treaty. But this is virtually certain to ensure new weapons development by the major nuclear weapons states, particularly Russia and China. The treatment for a small problem seems bound to make a larger problem grow by removing one of its most significant restraints.

The threat presently posed to the United States by rogue states is recognized as being remote, if it exists at all, in the field of ballistic missiles carrying nuclear warheads or other weapons of mass destruction. Such states are much more likely to use chemical or biological weapons, and possibly nuclear weapons, delivered on their behalf by terrorists, in a briefcase or a truck, to an American city. Iraq, for example, possesses such weapons, and now that its programs go uninspected Iraq is developing more of them. Mr. Bush specifically raised the specter of nuclear "blackmail" by Iraq. It is unclear, to say the least, how that indirect action could be deterred by missile defence.

China has certainly made clear that it does not accept the rogue state rationale and instead sees itself as the focus of a missile defence system. Russia has spoken in similar terms, although Mr. Bush held out - in his words, "perhaps one day" - the possibility of a joint American-Russian missile shield. China, at least, can be expected to respond by developing new quantities and qualities of missiles and warheads capable of compensating for the reduction in their deterrent capability that would be brought about by a defensive shield. In other words, the most likely outcome of missile defence will be a nuclear arms race.

The Bush administration's decision brings with it another cost, indeed, possibly the heaviest one. It will shake, to the foundations, the key international agreement which has supported an almost 40-year effort to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons - the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Thirty-eight years ago, four months after the Cuban missile crisis, President John F. Kennedy expressed grave concern about the possible emergence of some 20 or 30 countries possessing nuclear weapons. This problem was then addressed through the construction of the

nonproliferation treaty, which rests on an elemental bargain: nuclear weapons states, including the United States, undertook to work toward the elimination of nuclear weapons; states without such weapons undertook never to acquire them.

In the decades that followed, this bargain has essentially held together. Mr. Bush recognized that, in the cold war world, "few other nations had nuclear weapons," though he failed to indicate why that was. He did not mention the nonproliferation treaty. The only countries that have acquired nuclear weapons have been three of the four that never signed on to the treaty: Israel, India and Pakistan. All others have kept their promise never to acquire nuclear weapons, even though roughly 30 have the ability to do so. Three parties to the treaty have cheated on it to varying degrees - Iran, Iraq and North Korea, the rogue states named in current American policy statements on national missile defence. This cheating represents a failure of the treaty and needs to be addressed...

The proposed cuts in American nuclear weapons announced by President Bush must be welcomed in the context of the United States' undertakings under the nonproliferation treaty. But if they are made contingent on Russia agreeing to amendment or abandonment of the ABM treaty - and to American deployment of a national missile defence system - Mr. Bush's proposal would contradict the commitment made in May 2000 by the United States and the fundamental legal commitment made in the nonproliferation treaty. The president has authorized a major diplomatic effort to consult allies and, to some extent, potential adversaries. This should be welcomed, especially by Russia. But these consultations must address the fundamental challenge of strengthening the nonproliferation regime.

The administration's inclination toward unilateral action has the ring of single-minded dedication to national self-interest, muscularity and determination. That may play well in some reaches of the popular imagination, but it gravely misleads the public by implying that the United States can impose its preferences.

The Bush administration and its supporters in Congress have claimed repeatedly that international agreements and treaties like the nonproliferation treaty are unverifiable. Clearly they can be cheated on and have been, most particularly by Saddam Hussein's Iraq. The obvious cure for such cheating is to deal with it directly and to remedy infractions of the nonproliferation norm when they occur, and at their root. The United States could start by giving full financial support to the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Organization for the Prevention of Chemical Weapons. It should also consider military action, in concert with other major countries, to destroy facilities where weapons of mass destruction are being developed clandestinely.

A more constructive plan of action by the United States would have included specific proposals for deep cuts in strategic nuclear weapons, followed by the engagement of other nuclear weapons states in further

reductions; the standing down of strategic nuclear weapons from their cold war state of hair-trigger alert; the entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; and the early negotiation of a treaty banning the manufacture of fissile material for weapons purposes. An overwhelming majority of countries support these steps. If they were taken, the obvious right of the United States to continue to conduct research into defensive technologies would be seen in an entirely different light.

As long as any country has nuclear weapons, others will seek to acquire them. Reduction of the nuclear threat can best be accomplished directly through arms control and disarmament. This would cost a fraction of what the administration will need for missile defence. Building a wall, rather than tackling the problem head-on, is both to retreat and, in this case, to condemn all of us to failure.

*Richard Butler, diplomat in residence at the Council on Foreign Relations and former chairman of the United Nations special commission to disarm Iraq, is writing a book on nuclear arms control.*