

The Sixth ISODARCO Beijing Seminar on Arms Control
October 29-November 1, 1998
Shanghai, China

On No-First-Use Treaty

WU Jun

Beijing Institute of Applied Physics and Computational Mathematics
P.O. Box 8009
22, Beijing 100088, China

On No-First-Use Treaty

With the end of the cold war, the risk of catastrophic damage on the world caused by nuclear weapons has dramatically reduced. But the dangers of nuclear proliferation and the initiation of nuclear war by error or by accident have not been ruled out. Nuclear force reductions would decrease these dangers and enhance global security and the nuclear nonproliferation regime. I believe that the conclusion of a No-First-Use treaty will be a key step in the deep nuclear disarmament.

MOST NUCLEAR WEAPON STATES RELY ON THEIR NUCLEAR WEAPONS VERY MUCH

Currently, most nuclear powers adopt nuclear police in which they rely on their nuclear weapons very much. This would be harmful to the Non-proliferation regime.

The nuclear posture of the US was formed during the Cold War. The roles and missions of nuclear forces were intended to deter any forms of military aggression. They were against both nuclear attack and conventional attack. The end of the Cold War created new nuclear environment, in which the threats of massive nuclear war, and a large-scale military conflict have receded to an all-time low. In the new security era, the US still persists in the nuclear extended deterrence posture as mentioned above and it remains in the center of the US national security strategy.

Russia has gave up the no first use commitment by the former Soviet Union and reserves a nuclear option in response to a conventional attack from any quarters. The document “strategy for Russia” which was published in middle of 1992 declared that “Russia’s present economic and political weakness, as well its interests, make it necessary to preserve its reliance on nuclear weapons and on nuclear deterrence policy.”

France insists on making it clear that its nuclear strategy is not only independent but also conceptually distinct from that of NATO and that of the United States in particular. They take the nuclear weapons as the basis of their security. The “last resort” doctrine is the center of their nuclear police.

The UK takes the importance of Atlantic Alliance as a key factors in nuclear policy. It enjoys the “special relationship” with US. Its view of deterrence was based on readiness to use nuclear weapon to defend British territory, its armed forces, or its interests in the event of attack or coercion by an adversary with nuclear weapons or with significant or overwhelming conventional strength.

NO-FIRST-USE REGIME IS PROFITABLE TO ALL THE COUNTRIES.

All of the countries mentioned above take their nuclear weapons as a key factor in their national defense. This kind of nuclear strategy will give the non-nuclear weapon countries a signal that the nuclear disarmament is very limited. The nuclear weapons will exist forever. It will undermine the Non-proliferation Regime and arouse some countries trying to establish nuclear capability. Therefore, for the reason of nuclear non-proliferation, these nuclear countries should change their nuclear doctrine. No first

use is a good strategy for all states.

No first use is profitable to both the world and nuclear countries, and should be possibly accepted by all the nuclear countries.

For the small nuclear countries (France, Britain and China), they can not make first attack on any nuclear countries. Because they have very limited nuclear abilities, they could not win in a nuclear war, especially conflict with the super nuclear countries (USA and Russia). The No First Use regime would reduce the risk of the nuclear attack. Therefore, I believe the nuclear weapon in these countries should be used only to deter nuclear attack.

For USA and Russia, the threat of a large-scale conventional conflict has receded from each other. Both countries have emerged from the Cold War as the world preeminent conventional military power and they are well equipped to deter or defeat conventional attacks using conventional weapon alone. With the technology and industry background, they will keep the preeminent conventional military power for very long time. Nuclear proliferation is the biggest threat to the national security of the U.S and Russia. The NFU Pledges of the U.S. and Russia can encourage the non-nuclear-states to abide by their commitments not to develop nuclear weapon.

THERE ARE SOME VISIBLE CHARACTERISTICS TO EXPLAIN NFU.

As some arms control experts suggested, There are some visible characteristics to explain NFU.

First, the size of an operational nuclear arsenal will be very limited. The number of nuclear warheads used in retaliation to produce intolerable damage was estimated as hundreds. Considering the new social environment in which human lives are more respected, we think a hundred of highly survived nuclear weapon should be able to deter nuclear strikes.

Second, the tactical nuclear weapons are specially to attack military targets and they have lower threshold to be used. They are not suitable for retaliatory strike. Therefore, retain tactical nuclear weapon in operation is a dangerous sign of using them first.

Third, multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles should be limited. They are more suitable to first strike than retaliation.

Some intrusive and sensitive arrangement could be used to strengthen Non-First-Use treaty. For example, constraining accuracy, unloading nuclear warheads from delivery systems and sealing operational nuclear weapon.

SEVERAL MEASUREMENTS SHOULD BE PUSHED FOR THE NFU TREATY

Now, with the impetus of the end of the cold war, the nuclear arsenals of the U.S. and Russia are shrinking significantly. Termination of military confrontation between the Soviet Union and USA made it possible to reduce strategic and tactical nuclear weapons. Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine have relinquished their nuclear weapon.

South Africa has dismantled their 6 nuclear warheads and joined NPT. Indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty in 1995 and approval of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by the UN General Assembly in 1996 also made the favorable environment to nuclear disarmament. Canberra Commission has stated "The opportunity now exists, perhaps without precedent or recurrence, to make a new and clear choice to enable the world to conduct its affairs without nuclear weapons and in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations." I believe several steps we should take to push for the NFU Treaty.

The United States and Russia must continue to take lead in reducing nuclear arsenal. Although START II limits the number of warheads that can be mounted on strategic delivery vehicles, it does not limit the number or types of warheads that each side may possess. That is, under the terms of the treaty, each side can keep as many warheads as they desire. The treaty only limited how many of those warheads may be mounted on long-range missiles or bombers. This failure to limit warheads, combined with the inherent capability of some delivery vehicles to carry many more warheads than START II permits, provides the possibility of rapid breakout. Russia or US could relatively quickly place additional warheads on land- and sea- based missiles and bombers. Now US and Russia Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin have agreed on a framework for START III. To make nuclear disarmament more solid, more practical and irreversible, it should be carry out the talk on monitor warhead stockpiles and dismantling activities during the START III negotiation. Scientists should study a method to deal with the weapon used material more economic and more practical.

SUMMARY

The nuclear weapons should have played much less importance in the world than they do now. People know that the nuclear war could not be happened, because no one would be the winner. The nuclear states should take real steps to show that they abide by the pledge of Article 6 of NPT.

"NFU" can play an important role in non-proliferation. Nuclear weapon is only a retaliatory strike tools under NFU; the roles of nuclear weapon will be reduced. This will give the world a sign that producing nuclear weapon is useless in any case but just cost money.

Nuclear states should negotiate NFU treaty to constrain their first strike capabilities. If all nuclear weapon states seriously take their responsibilities and people have confidence in that, the NFU regime will automatically become a no use regime.