



# The US Nuclear Posture Review: How the NPR Repudiates the NPT

*A Briefing Paper from  
International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War*

On January 9, 2002 the US Department of Defense briefed reporters on the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), a congressionally mandated report on the goals and structure of US nuclear forces. The NPR is a classified report. An unclassified version has not yet been released. Therefore, this synopsis is based entirely on the transcript of the media briefing.

The premise of the Nuclear Posture Review, as reiterated throughout the briefing, is that the Cold War is over, Russia is no longer a nuclear adversary, and the “international security environment” requires a transformation in US strategic forces. The NPR makes it abundantly clear, however, that the US, rather than fulfilling its commitment under the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) to “an unequivocal undertaking” toward the elimination of nuclear weapons, has reasserted the centrality of nuclear weapons to its national defense policy. The US intends not only to maintain thousands of nuclear warheads well into the middle of this century, but also to “modernize” its nuclear forces by adding new types of warheads that will eventually require a resumption of nuclear testing.

## **NPR Synopsis**

The specific policies articulated in the NPR include the following:

1. While deterrence based on the notion of “mutual assured destruction” is no longer appropriate, a “capabilities-based” arsenal of nuclear weapons will continue to play a “fundamental” role. According to J.D. Crouch, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy, the US is “currently projecting to keep the nuclear forces that we have to 2020 and beyond—and longer, and beyond.”

2. The strategic triad—nuclear weapons deployed on land-based missiles, submarines, and bombers—will be embedded in what the NPR describes as a “new triad” that includes both nuclear and non-nuclear capabilities and much greater emphasis on command and control systems. According to Crouch, “[W]e continue to need nuclear forces as well as other elements of the new triad, both to assure our friends and allies of US security commitments and to dissuade potential competitors from competing with the United States in ways that are harmful to US security and allied security.”

3. An “operationally deployed” force of nuclear weapons, intended to deal with “immediate and unexpected contingencies,” will contain between 1,700 and 2,000 warheads available for launch in time periods ranging from minutes to weeks. Additional warheads—presumably thousands of them, though the public explanation of the NPR is ambiguous on this point—will be maintained in a “responsive capability,” ready to be re-deployed on demand.

4. The size of the US nuclear arsenal will be reduced from the current level of about 6,000 warheads to the projected 1,700 to 2,000-warhead level over the next 10-18 years. The plan is to make reductions to 3,800 “operationally deployed” warheads by 2007, with the balance of the cuts to occur by 2020. The MX missile force and four Trident submarines will be taken down; the requirement for the B-1 bomber to maintain a nuclear capability will be removed.

5. The Pentagon will always hold open the option to “flatten out” (i.e., halt) the reductions or even to increase the size of the US arsenal to previous levels. In other words, there is nothing irreversible about these reductions.

6. The NPR firmly commits the Administration to the development and deployment of a

National Missile Defense (NMD) system, and appears to link reductions to NMD deployment.

7. The Bush Administration continues to oppose CTBT ratification but will continue, for now, to adhere to the testing moratorium begun under President Clinton. Nevertheless, the NPR calls on the Department of Energy (DOE) to accelerate its “test-readiness program,” so that a resumption of nuclear tests could take place more rapidly than it presently could (two to three years) should the Administration decide to abandon the moratorium.

8. The DOE’s Stockpile Stewardship Program will continue, with the goal of providing the Pentagon with “modifications and refurbishments...of nuclear warhead systems,” in particular, the W-76 (Trident ) warhead, the W-80 warhead for air-launched cruise missile, and the advanced cruise missile, and the B-61 and other air-dropped bombs.

9. DOE will resume production of tritium, using commercial light-water reactors, by the end of the decade.

### **Implications of the NPR**

First and most important, the Nuclear Posture Review makes it clear that the US has no intention of honoring its Non-Proliferation Treaty commitments and has asserted a permanent role for nuclear weapons—numbering in the thousands—as a core element of its military policy for decades to come. The implicit threat to resume nuclear testing as soon as new warhead designs emerge from the DOE weapons labs shows instead that the US is making an “unequivocal undertaking” to add a new generation of nuclear weapons to its arsenal even as it removes older ones.

Second, the much-touted warhead reductions begin to look like a shell game, with unspecified numbers going into an inactive “responsive” force, ready to be re-deployed on short notice. This is far from a step toward nuclear disarmament: Pentagon spokesman Crouch denied that it was even a form of de-alerting.

Third, even these misleading and reversible reductions are held hostage to the development and deployment of missile defenses. Crouch described NMD (a term that is no longer used by the Pentagon) as one element of a “diverse portfolio of options” including a smaller nuclear force and “additional non-nuclear strike capabilities” that would allow the US to defeat an attack with a weapon of mass destruction. This raises a disturbing question: Aside from the many other problems with NMD, is this latest version of “Star Wars,” like the SDI scheme of the Reagan years, an essential component of a first-strike capability against rogue states?

Fourth and potentially most dangerous, the NPR continues a trend in US strategic policy in which the distinctions between nuclear and non-nuclear “missions” and even nuclear and non-nuclear weapons become blurred. One goal, for example, is to have a “capability” to destroy an underground bunker. That capability could be nuclear or non-nuclear. The response to a nuclear missile attack by a rogue state or by terrorists could be nuclear or non-nuclear, depending on the President’s menu selection. The threat of nuclear reprisal is available to deter attacks with chemical or biological weapons, or to destroy facilities suspected of producing them.

For those committed to the abolition of nuclear weapons, the NPR is an extraordinarily dangerous cul de sac.

## US Nuclear Posture Review: The IPPNW Response

March 13, 2002

George W. Bush  
The White House  
1600 Pennsylvania Ave.  
Washington, DC 20510  
USA

Dear President Bush:

As the Co-Presidents of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW), which was awarded the 1985 Nobel Peace Prize for raising global awareness of the medical and environmental consequences of nuclear war, we wish to express our deep concern that the recently completed Nuclear Posture Review represents a repudiation of US disarmament commitments under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), and thus will undermine decades of efforts to prevent the spread -- and eventual use -- of nuclear arms.

The Los Angeles Times reports that the NPR names seven countries -- five of which are non nuclear states -- as targets of US nuclear weapons and that the US plans to develop small, tactical nuclear weapons for use in a variety of battlefield contingencies. If accurately described, this targeting policy will make the use of nuclear weapons more, rather than less, likely and must be retracted. Such a policy is also in violation of international law according to the 1996 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.

US nuclear policy as we now understand it places the world in greater jeopardy of nuclear war than at any time since the height of the Cold War. By asserting a central role for nuclear weapons well into the middle of this century, the NPR removes all incentive for the existing nuclear weapon states to disarm. Countries that joined the NPT on the condition that the nuclear weapon states, including the US, would honor their disarmament obligations under Article VI, might well reconsider their own "nuclear postures."

The reductions in strategic nuclear weapons that have been announced as a key element of the NPR would be welcome as an important step toward US disarmament obligations were it not for the apparent decision to retain most of them in an inactive "responsive" force, ready to be re-deployed on short notice. This shift in the operational status of US warheads does not equate to a reduction in the size of the arsenal in any legitimate sense and, in any case, is too easily reversible.

Moreover, we cannot avoid the conclusion, from what has been published about the NPR, that the US intends to resume nuclear testing as soon as new warhead designs emerge from the DOE weapons labs, so that a new generation of nuclear weapons can be added to the arsenal even as older ones are removed. If the US "modernizes" its nuclear arsenal, other countries will do the same. A resumption of nuclear testing in the US will inevitably lead to a global breakdown of the decade long moratorium on testing, which has been one of the most promising developments in the global campaign to prevent further nuclear proliferation.

Your administration has already declared its intention to withdraw from the ABM Treaty in order to develop and deploy an enormously expensive system that cannot protect against the most likely means of nuclear weapons delivery by terrorists or by countries that might acquire a small number of nuclear weapons with hostile intent against the US. Missile defenses will provoke other nuclear weapons states to counter what they see as a threat to their own security by building more nuclear weapons rather than by honoring their treaty commitments.

Finally, the NPR underscores a dangerous trend in US strategic policy in which the distinctions between nuclear and non-nuclear "missions" -- and even nuclear and non-nuclear weapons -- become blurred. Giving officers in the field a nuclear "capability" to destroy an underground bunker, for example, increases the likelihood that the nuclear threshold will be crossed by military decision makers who would come to think of nuclear weapons as just one

option among many. This must never be allowed to happen.

As physicians concerned with the prevention of nuclear war, our objections to US nuclear policy as articulated in the NPR take on a heightened sense of urgency given the expansion of US military activity around the world, enormous increases in military spending that cannot be justified by legitimate concerns over terrorism, and a disturbing trend toward unilateral decision making. Rather than leading the way toward a world in which our common security is assured, as much as possible, by the norms and structures of international law and by policies that address and alleviate the root causes of conflict, the United States is needlessly endangering not only American lives, but the lives of people throughout the world who, unless this policy is reversed, must continue to live under the shadow of weapons of mass destruction for generations to come.

IPPNW and its affiliates joined the world in condemning the terrorist attacks against the US on September 11, and we mourned the loss of innocent life. We were gratified to see the huge reservoir of sympathy for the victims of those attacks, for their families, and for the rescue workers who lost their lives in the attempt to save the lives of others. We are terribly saddened, therefore, at the prospect that the US could squander the good will of the international community by adopting what amounts to a permanent state of war in which nuclear threats play an ever more intricate part.

There is another way. The US and the other nuclear weapon states can negotiate a verifiable and enforceable Nuclear Weapons Convention that would release the world from its perpetual state of nuclear terror. As the world's wealthiest nation, the US is also in a unique position -- and has a unique responsibility -- to lead the nations of the world in efforts to alleviate the conditions that give rise to terrorism and to global conflict.

On behalf of our affiliates, comprising medical associations in 65 countries, we urge you to abandon the course set out in the Nuclear Posture Review, to honor the US commitment to eliminate its nuclear weapons, and to join the international community in productive, collaborative efforts to resolve conflicts without resort to war.

Sincerely,

Mary-Wynne Ashford  
Co-President, Canada

Abraham Behar, MD  
Co-President, France

Sergei Grachev, MD  
Co-President, Russia

### **Statement by Norwegian Physicians against Nuclear Weapons (IPPNW-Norway)**

Embassy of the United States of America in Norway  
Att: Ambassador John D. Ong  
Drammensveien 18  
0244 Oslo

Dear ambassador John D. Ong,

On behalf of the board of Norwegian Physicians against Nuclear Weapons (NLA) which is our national affiliate of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW), I first of all want to wish you cordially welcome to Norway and your new position as ambassador of the United States of America in our country.

As our organization is concerned with the threat from nuclear weapons to all humankind, and is strongly engaged in questions of nuclear abolition, we have been able to have a dialog with the American Embassy on these questions through the last years.

In that context you must also allow me to express our deep concern about the information from the recently released US Nuclear Posture Review, and the statements from President George W. Bush that nuclear weapons shall now to a larger extent be integrated with conventional weapons, and that there is a possibility that nuclear weapons can once again be used against innocent human beings.

I therefore sincerely hope that you as the US ambassador in Norway can reassure our people that the threat of using nuclear weapons by the US is indeed a false warning, and that such inhuman and indiscriminating weapons of mass destruction will never be used by your country against any human beings.

For your information about the concern of our colleagues world wide, I also attach a statement from the US organization Physicians for Social Responsibility, and a copy of a letter from the IPPNW central office in Boston to President Bush.

Trondheim March 19, 2002

Sincerely yours

Bjørn Hilt MD  
Chairman and international councillor of NLA  
Professor of Occupational Medicine at the  
Norwegian university of Science and Technology in Trondheim

### **Open letter to George W. Bush from Physicians for Social Responsibility (IPPNW-USA)**

March 8, 2002

President George W. Bush  
The White House  
Washington, DC

Dear Mr. President,

We write to you on behalf of Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR), an organization which shares the Nobel Peace Prize and which represents over 20,000 US physicians and health professionals deeply engaged with caring for our fellow humans and the social, economic, and ecological systems essential to health and well-being. We are profoundly concerned about the recent pronouncements, policies, and priorities of your Administration in the wake of the initial military response to the September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States.

US military actions to capture or destroy Al Qaeda and eradicate its base of support from the former Taliban regime in Afghanistan have been supported by most Americans. These efforts are carried out with authorization from the United States Congress and in accordance with the UN Charter's right of self-defense. However, such authority was not intended as an unending license to permit unilateral, unauthorized attacks anywhere on the globe or to drastically escalate US military spending and overseas military bases, to promote massive arms transfers, and to conduct diplomacy by threat.

We are particularly disturbed by bellicose, provocative rhetoric and unilateral threats to sovereign nations, made outside the framework of international law and without the support of the international community. Such statements erode the honored place of the United States as a nation that

has, at its best, not only defended freedom, but upheld human rights, international cooperation, humanitarian aid, and the rule of international law. We are specifically opposed to:

- The depiction of North Korea, Iran, and Iraq as an "axis of evil," blurring distinctions between nations and people, foreclosing diplomacy, and providing rallying points for anti-American extremists.
- The proposed Defense budget increase of \$48 billion, composed mainly of bloated Cold War programs. This amount alone is roughly double the entire sum the US spends annually on all diplomacy, international relations, and aid. Just this increase, by itself, exceeds the defense budget of any nation in the world, with the exception of Russia. This is excessive and will perpetuate a permanent US war economy.
- The unilateral abrogation of the ABM Treaty, the unilateral renunciation of the Kyoto Protocol, the failure to support the ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, and the failure to support any effective verification mechanisms for the Biological Weapons Convention.
- The Nuclear Posture Review which foresees US nuclear weapons possession and production throughout the 21st Century. This stance flouts US legal obligations under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and stimulates the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Proliferation increases terrorists' ability to obtain nuclear devices.
- The abandonment of long-standing US policy under various Administrations to renounce the use of nuclear weapons against nations which do not possess them. According to the International Court of Justice, this is both morally indefensible and legally impermissible.

Taken together, these and other actions of your Administration are fueling anti-American sentiment worldwide. Coupled with inattention to economic development, medical and public health demands, environmental degradation, human rights, education and other needs both abroad and at home, such policies threaten, in the long term, to bring on the instability, conflict, and terrorism we all seek to prevent.

We therefore call upon you to renounce unilateral military actions and to carry out US foreign and military policies in accordance with international law. We call upon you to shift US priorities away from military solutions and toward nuclear disarmament, the diplomatic resolution of conflicts, and the fulfillment of worldwide human needs.

As President, we call upon you to lead Americans in overcoming fear and reclaiming our core democratic values after the tragic events of September 11. This goal cannot be accomplished by military action alone. You must lead us in declaring our love of civil rights, freedom, and fairness. Lead us in a renewed American commitment to the painstaking work of peaceful, collaborative conflict resolution. Lead us to a world united in oneness of purpose as we confront global military and environmental threats to human health, sustainability, survival. Such leadership, we believe, will be most consistent with our long-term security interests and with America's deepest values. We will look forward to working along with you and with all Americans to achieve these aims.

Sincerely,

Roy Farrell, MD  
President  
Physicians for Social Responsibility

Robert K. Musil, PhD,  
Executive Director and CEO  
Physicians for Social Responsibility

## **Forcing the World Backward**

*Bernard Lown, MD*

Paul Richter's article entitled "US Works Up Plan for Using Nuclear Arms" in Saturday's Boston Globe evoked deep anxieties. Forty one years ago, with medical colleagues, I initiated the Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR) against nuclear weapons. Twenty years ago with Dr. Yevgeni Chazov, we launched the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW). We were rapidly recognized as a seminal force in helping reverse the nuclear arms race heading humankind to the brink. For our services in mobilizing global public opinion against the nuclear threat we were awarded the Nobel Peace Prize and numerous other recognitions. The road from the brink was a tortured and difficult one. Essentially it was a struggle for shedding Hitler's legacy of resort to genocide by stockpiling instruments of mass murder.

It is therefore painful to witness our reinvention of the cold war now labeled the war on terrorism. It is appalling to witness the difficult and slow progress with the Test Ban Treaty under president Kennedy, the Non Proliferation Treaty, and the ABM Treaty being jettisoned by the Bush administration. Aside from the obscene immorality of these policies, these actions besmirch the good name of our country, enlarge the sense of outrage against America's disregard of international law, and unleash forces with unintended and dreadful consequences.

The inexorable logic of the current military posture of integrating nuclear with conventional weapons removes the firewall that has from the very outset of the atomic age separated the two. It gives sanction for every country, that is able, to go nuclear. It guarantees that sooner or later nuclear devices will become the indispensable murderous instruments of terrorists. The USA has porous boundaries. As we have failed against drugs flooding this country so will we fail to interdict the entry of nuclear material. Instead of attacking the Twin Towers, had the al Qaeda gang resorted to some nuclear mayhem, it would take years rather than months to clear the radioactive debris to make Manhattan once again habitable.

Blindly the Bush Administration is forcing the world backward. Do we really wish to convert this world into a jungle? The periodic and carefully timed release of terror alerts by this administration diverts public attention from what is transpiring and frightens congress into pusillanimous silence.

Americans better begin to speak out in moral outrage before the lights go out.

*Dr. Lown is Co-Founder of IPPNW and Professor Emeritus, Harvard School of Public Health. The above letter was submitted to the Boston Globe on March 11,2002.*

## **Slippery Slope To Damnation**

*Ronald S. McCoy, MD*

The news of a Bush administration policy document, the US Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), makes explicit a dangerous shift in US nuclear policy that threatens to violate US legal and political obligations and undermine nuclear disarmament. It becomes clear that the US now projects the role of nuclear weapons into the 21st century as legitimate weapons for waging war. This flouts the 1996 ruling of the International Court of Justice. The NPR has named seven countries as possible targets: Russia, China, North Korea, Iran, Iraq, Libya and Syria. The Pentagon has been ordered to draft contingency plans for the use of nuclear weapons against these countries. The thinking behind the NPR is reckless and dangerous.

The NPR, a classified document that will guide US nuclear policies, expands the role of nuclear weapons beyond their core function as a deterrent against nuclear attack.

It recommends a lowering of the threshold for the use of nuclear weapons, including against targets able to withstand a conventional attack, as a response to the threat or use of chemical or biological weapons, or "in the event of surprising military developments," meaning terrorist attacks. The NPR establishes the broad outline of Pentagon planning for a new nuclear strategy, force levels, and infrastructure for the next ten years and beyond.

The entire report is classified and usually receives little attention from the news media and analysts. This is most unfortunate. The logic and assumptions underlying the administration's hostility to arms control and its infatuation with nuclear weapons deserve close public scrutiny and vigorous debate. Not since the resurgence of the Cold War in Ronald Reagan's first term has there been such an emphasis on nuclear weapons in US defense strategy.

The Bush Administration assumes that nuclear weapons will be part of US military forces for a long time to come and is planning an extensive and costly program to sustain and modernize the existing force. According to the NPR, nuclear weapons will continue to play a "critical role" because they possess "unique properties" that provide "credible military options" for holding at risk "a wide range of target types" important to a potential adversary's threatened use of "weapons of mass destruction" or "large-scale conventional military force."

Behind the rhetorical mask of post-Cold War restraint lie expansive plans to revitalise US nuclear forces within a so-called "New Triad" of capabilities that combine nuclear and conventional offensive strikes with missile defenses and a nuclear weapons infrastructure that has the capacity to upgrade existing nuclear weapons and develop and produce entirely new, low-yield, earth penetrating nuclear weapons. This military posture of integrating nuclear with conventional weapons removes the firewall that has for long separated the two and lowered the threshold for the use of nuclear weapons in a conflict.

The NPR's eventual goal is in "adjusting its immediate nuclear forces requirements" downward, from 8,000 warheads today to 3,800 in 2007 and then to 1,700-2,000 "operationally deployed weapons." With an accounting system worthy of Enron, this claim of weapons reduction is a deception, because under the plan an additional 7,800 intact nuclear warheads and components for 5,000 more, making a total of 15,000, will remain in storage, ready for deployment at any time.

The NPR effectively precludes further US "good faith" participation in international negotiations on nuclear disarmament under Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Together with its announced withdrawal from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, its rejection of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, its development of new nuclear weapons, and its implicit threat to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapon states, the United States is losing its credibility as a responsible member of the international community. The posture of avoiding constraints on its nuclear policies will be viewed by many nations as a blatant breach of "good faith," tantamount to a US "breakout" from the NPT.

The Cold War is being reinvented as a war against terrorism. Last month, the US abandoned its longstanding pledge not to use nuclear weapons against countries that do not possess them, by threatening to attack any nation that is suspected of developing biological or chemical weapons of mass destruction. Far from deterring terrorism, it guarantees that sooner or later nuclear devices will be in the hands of suicidal terrorists.

Does the Bush Administration not realize that nuclear bombs kill millions in minutes by incineration, blast, firestorm and radiation? Has it not heard enough about genocide and crimes against humanity in the Milosevic trial going on in The Hague?

The friends and allies of the United States will be just as culpable if they continue with their military alliances or remain silent. Non-nuclear countries, allied to the United States in NATO, must re-examine their military obligations, repudiate them on moral and legal grounds, and end their membership of an outdated military alliance that is a major impediment to nuclear disarmament.

The world is teetering on a slippery slope to damnation. The terrorist attacks on the United States on 11 September should not be a justification for this tide of nuclear militarism that threatens to engulf the world eventually in a nuclear holocaust. Living in a democratic country, the American people must recover from their fear and hysteria and assume responsibility for the policies and actions of their government.

All governments, including the Malaysian government, must make representations to the American government and oppose policies that would have a disastrous impact globally.

*Dr. McCoy is Chair of Malaysian Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War and is a former Co-President of IPPNW.*

## **Bombing Anyone They Darn Well Please**

*Joanna Santa Barbara*

Recently the world slid one very nasty step towards greater violence and lawlessness, and nearer to the use of nuclear weapons. A leaked Pentagon document describes US plans for the use of nuclear weapons in the years ahead. To plan to use nuclear weapons at all is a flagrant breach of promise. The US, along with 186 other states, signed on to a review of the Nonproliferation Treaty in 2000. This contained an "unequivocal commitment" to the abolition of nuclear weapons. Once again, and most seriously, the US flouts international law.

In this Nuclear Posture Review the US lowers the threshold for use of nuclear weapons in two ways. Firstly it plans to develop "smaller" nuclear weapons, presumably hoping to break down the widespread moral revulsion against using them. Secondly, the US has announced it will no longer observe the agreement in the Nonproliferation Treaty to use nuclear weapons only against other nuclear-armed states. It says it will target not only Russia and China, which are nuclear-armed, but also Iraq, North Korea, Syria, Iran and Libya, which are not. Lowering the threshold by the US is likely to lead to reciprocal policy changes by other nuclear weapon states, multiplying the likelihood of use of nuclear weapons by one of them. Continuing the currency of nuclear weapons as the ultimate violence also increases the likelihood of terrorist use.

The Bush administration apparently wants to be limited by no constraints whatsoever in using nuclear bombs on whomever and whenever it pleases. . Do they have any idea what nuclear bombs do to children, women and men? They incinerate thousands, thousands more die in the flying debris of the blast and firestorm, and thousands more die by sloughing off their irradiated guts. They kill millions in minutes. They cannot tell the difference between a tank and a baby. The use of nuclear bombs breaks so many of the agreements of international law that the International Court of Justice declared it generally illegal in 1996, and exhorted the nuclear weapons states to move towards abolishing these illegal weapons.

There are those who soothe themselves with the fiction that any use of nuclear bombs by "our friends" the US would be benevolent and justified. Use by others, of course, would be malevolent and unjustified. Such biased attributions are universally applied when any line is drawn between "us" and "them". This fiction is dramatically shattered by the release last week of tapes of Richard Nixon's security discussions during the Vietnam War. He tells then Secretary of State Henry Kissinger that he wants to use the nuclear bomb on North Vietnam. When Kissinger demurs, he says, "You're so goddamned concerned about civilians and I don't give a damn." It will be a startling idea to many that Kissinger was seen as concerned about civilians (he is presently charged by Belgium with war crimes), but deeply shocking that Nixon saw himself as much less so.

Have subsequent administrations shown more concern for civilians when the US is in conflict with another state? Thousands of civilian deaths in Panama under Bush senior, thousands in

Afghanistan under Bush junior, and tens of thousands from the sanctions on Iraq tell us this is not the case. This is the state with whom we in Canada have our most important security arrangements, particularly embodied in the NORAD treaty and in the NATO structure. Our federal government is about to launch major reviews of defence and foreign policies, with a view to greater military integration with the US. There may be legitimate reasons to cooperate more closely on perimeter surveillance. But Canada must create an even greater distance between ourselves and the US in its policies on nuclear weapons. We should avoid any cooperation with and support of these grossly immoral policies, and should attempt to influence our neighbour against proceeding in its current dangerous direction with respect to nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons "defence systems". The Canadian government has argued that it should retain membership in the Nuclear Planning Group in NATO in order to exert influence on the three nuclear weapons states in NATO. It might be a stronger statement to resign from this group now. It is likely that most Canadians would want no part of supporting a state that intends to use nuclear weapons on whomever and whenever it pleases.

*Joanna Santa Barbara is a Hamilton physician, a member of Physicians for Global Survival (IPPNW-Canada) and of the Centre for Peace Studies at McMaster University.*

*March 2002*