

social and economic conditions for the wretched of the world. When they failed to deliver on these promises, in some places, Marxist ideologies were replaced by religious fundamentalism, which promises nothing material in this world and is therefore much harder to discredit. Coalition policy options should be considered in this context. **The U.S. government should understand that crushing the wretched of the world will not resolve the terrorist threat. Instead, the government should aim to build a more tolerable, equitable world.**

3.2. Robert Lawrence (Department of Political Science, Colorado State University)

Robert Lawrence raised the possibility of nuclear terrorism. **He said that the potential devastation warrants a policy of assertive disarmament.** Arms control regimes should be developed and implemented to control fissile material and to prevent the dispersion of devices to build delivery systems. Potential sites for the development of nuclear and radiological weapons, including research facilities, should be targeted. While the cooperation of other countries, especially Russia, would be preferable, the U.S. may have to proceed with trying to prevent nuclear proliferation, unilaterally.

The possibility of nuclear terrorism in the context of Assured Vulnerability poses questions for plans to deploy BMD and consequently to scrap (alter) the ABM Treaty. Some observers suggest that the U.S. deploy defensive systems in space. Others push for multilateral solutions (i.e., providing funds for Russian nuclear scientists to refocus their research, for instance, or cooperatively immobilising Russian-made plutonium). Nonetheless, “incoherent exceptionalism” will likely continue to characterise U.S. foreign policy in the future.

3.3. Discussion

A question was raised about possible reactions of the U.S. government to a potential nuclear attack in the context of the “civilisation *versus* barbarism” debate, where those individuals who target civilians for political purposes (and those who assist them) are considered uncivilised. **The moral question facing U.S. policy makers is how to adequately respond to a possible nuclear attack without resorting themselves to barbarism.**

Some participants addressed the growing pressure on the U.S. government by hardliners for a massive military build-up (including BMD) “just in case” the terrorists acquire the capability to attack with nuclear armed missiles. This pressure is countered by more moderate voices, arguing that BMD can not tackle other, often more practical, means of delivery of nuclear weapons. Moreover, BMD does not address the unending list of non-nuclear threats (from chemical and biological attacks to car bomb explosions). In this context, BMD plans will likely be downscaled to build a limited system (of about one hundred interceptors) so that equal attention can be paid to other types of defence. Multilateralism will likely continue to play a crucial role in the success of the anti-terrorism campaign, especially as (non-state) access to nuclear weapons widens. U.S. “incoherent exceptionalism” (including tearing-up the ABM Treaty) will likely not contribute to peace and stability around the world.