

N.Kollerstrom, PhD , FRAS  
Science & Technology Studies Dept.,  
University College London,  
Gower Street,  
London WC1E 6BT  
[nk@astro3.demon.co.uk](mailto:nk@astro3.demon.co.uk)

21.4.03

British Pugwash Group

US Defence Policy

Dear Editor,

At the PUGWASH seminar on arms control at the Royal Society (Nov 14) the US's new military posture was well outlined by Dr Stephen Miller (Director of the International Security Program, Center for Science and International Affairs, at Harvard University). Whereas the UN Charter commits nations to 'refrain ... from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state' (1945, San Francisco), Dr Miller explained how the Bush doctrine permitted America to attack any nation, any time, with any weapons system it chooses, unencumbered by international treaties, on the mere suspicion that it 'might' harbour terrorists.

Dr Miller explained how the NPT, CTBT, BWC and Landmine Convention have all been thrown out, along with the ICC and Khyoto Treaty. He did not allude to any reason why America should need an arms budget equal to that of the next eight nations in sequence. It is here relevant that Afghanistan was the 23<sup>rd</sup> nation bombed by America since WW2, if one starts counting from Japan in 1945, and that the US comprises some 4% of the world's population but consumes some 30% of its resources. Other nations have had to understand that their most precious resources are mere tributaries that must flow towards America. The US appears as a predator-nation whose continual interventions in other states, extinguishing their hopes of national sovereignty and independence to keep the US multinational tentacles fully supplied, is what defines the required magnitude of the US military. Blum's book *Rogue State* describes over sixty of these interventions, overt or covert, which means that roughly one in three of these invasions have involved bombing. . Those whom Dr Miller alluded to as 'bad guys' and 'terrorists' might be more appositely viewed as persons who object to this process.

Dr Miller did not point out, that the Bush 'axis of evil' concept is inherently racist as alluding to darker-skinned nations of Muslim faith. Let's note that of the 23 nations bombed by the US since WW2, only one had a predominantly white populace (Serbia) and an unduly large proportion have been, and continue to be, Muslim. If one must speak of an Axis of Evil, it should rather comprise the US and UK, for these go to war more often than any other nations, have been the two number one arms exporters right through the 1990s (before that, the Soviet Union was number two), and have indeed both repeatedly used chemical weapons against other nations - I'm not aware of any other nations of whom that can be said. Also, the US & UK have consistently voted against UN motions on peace & disarmament, more than any other nations (France being third on this list and Israel, fourth: see my study at [www.action-for-un-renewal.org.uk/pages/votes.htm](http://www.action-for-un-renewal.org.uk/pages/votes.htm)). The US/UK 'axis of evil' has bombed three different capital cities over a ten-year period, with no discernable sign of remorse: Baghdad, Kabul and Belgrade.

Also, Britain is now the jail capital of Western Europe - the Euro-average is 1.0 jailed citizens per thousand, while the UK leads with 1.4 - and the US, with around two million citizens incarcerated, leads the world with a staggering 6.7 citizens per thousand in jail. This is, we should recognise, an important consequence of the US-UK dedication to militarism, that these two nations have a higher proportion of their citizens jailed than anywhere else. Continual bombing of other people's towns and villages, as foreign policy breeds citizens who can't readily see why laws should be adhered to.

Dr Miller eloquently presented the US's view that Iraq had ordered out the UN inspectors in 1998, thereby stopping their essential work, and that it was only the war-threat by the present US administration that was now getting them back on track again. In the interests of historical veracity, let's note that the UN inspectors were ordered out of Iraq in December 1998 because the Clinton administration had decided to re-bomb ('Operation Desert Fox'); that, before this in '96 the US staged an assassination-attempt against Saddam Hussein, using UNSCOM-derived information; that Mossad was also found to be in possession of such highly-sensitive data; that the military had corrupted UNSCOM by using its information to ascertain their bombing targets, thereby precipitating a crisis which dissolved UNSCOM; and that it was this which terminated the inspection-process.

Dr Miller also presented the US Government's claims, that Iraq had developed its nuclear-bomb endeavour, and had been secretly making chemical and/or biological weapons, during the '90s. All of the recent evidence has only confirmed what Scott Ritter wrote in his *Endgame* that there simply was no Iraqi nuclear weapons program in the 1990s. In retrospect, the continual pretence by the US/UK that Iraq had WMD maintained right through the 1990s and up to the brink of war, with no scrap of evidence ever appearing to substantiate this claim, so that the war was fought on totally fraudulent grounds, surely deserves further debate. Should Dr Miller wish to speak again to Pugwash, would it not be appropriate to invite him to speak about the sheer extent to which 'evidence' on this was fabricated by the US/UK? It now seems fairly clear that Iraq really did destroy all its CBWs in the early '90s as required by the UN SC resolutions,

Yours sincerely,

Nick Kollerstrom