

“failure” of non-proliferation policies in these cases and thus the need to resort to counter-proliferation. In a 1993, speech to the Committee on International Security and Arms Control of the National Academy of Science, the U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Counter-proliferation announced the launching of the Counter proliferation Initiative (CPI). This was reflective of then Secretary of Defence Les Aspin’s Bottom-Up Review (BUR) of defence policy which took note of the changed international circumstances brought about by the ending of the Cold War and the “ability of the United States to limit the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.” Aspin concluded “that preventing proliferation with the policies of persuasion and denial would be less effective in the 21st century for the United States.” Thus the BUR identified the need for counter-proliferation of WMD.<sup>90</sup>

The CPI seeks to prevent the spread of WMDs, to “roll-back” their acquisition, to deter their use, to adopt defensive measures, such as greater protection for U.S. forces, when they were used and if necessary to take “offensive measures” to deal with proliferation. It called the changes to the strategies and composition of American forces to allow them to “successfully” respond “to major regional contingencies that involve” states who might be armed with WMDs. In the 1995 Unified Command Plan, the Joint Chiefs of Staff issued a memo which “delegated the mission of countering proliferation” of WMDs “to the military commanders responsible for regions considered to be at high risk.”

The Clinton administration is planning to spend as much as \$12 billion on protecting its armed forces and civilian population from WMD attacks. This includes a program to “prepare large and medium size cities for handling chemical and biological attacks.” In May 2000, the Justice Department and the Federal Emergency Management Agency “simulated a series of mock biological and chemical terrorist attacks in program involving thousands of people and closely watched by top U.S. officials-to test the readiness of local, state and federal governments to handle potential crises involving WMD attacks.” There is the growing view, expressed by Central Intelligence Director George Tenet that the counterproliferation efforts against the spread of WMD weapons, “has been gradually losing ground.” The “challenge is to find policies to deter the use of these weapons, develop countermeasures,” such as NDM, “and plan on handling crises that might arise should WMD be released.”<sup>91</sup>

The new United States Joint Forces Command has been given responsibility for “homeland defense” including “providing military assistance to civil authorities for consequence management of weapons of mass destruction incidents within the continental United States, its territories and possessions.” It will also “support the WMD consequence management efforts of the other

---

<sup>90</sup> *Ibid*, p. 16.

<sup>91</sup> “Weapons of Mass Destruction: A New Dimension in U.S. Middle East Policy,” *Middle East Review of International Affairs* (4 June 2000) on-line edition.