

in its 1994 US Nuclear Posture Review. The review calls for a "Nuclear Expeditionary Force" primarily for use against China or Third World targets. There have been reports that the Pentagon is testing computer models enabling the US to aim nuclear weapons against Third World targets, in addition to developing a "bunker buster" or "micro-nuke" for use in a regional conflict. Cdr. Green points out that these new weapons would release massive radioactive fallout.

Cdr. Green expects that all NATO members would participate in these plans, since nuclear acquiescence is considered "the litmus test of loyalty." Already, member states such as Germany, Italy and Belgium are providing homes for the building of a new generation of "vaults" to house nuclear weapons beneath aircraft under the floor of hardened aircraft shelters. These would increase weapon survival in an attack, allow for aircraft to be armed more quickly and avoid the vulnerable movement of weapons from remote storage igloos to aircraft.

Cdr. Green believes the World Court advisory opinion challenges the following aspects of NATO's nuclear weapons policy:

- Plans to protect "vital interests" and to strike non-nuclear states and so-called rogue states;
- NATO's persistence to keep open "first use";
- Nuclear deterrent patrols carrying weapons so powerful that it would be impossible for them not to be indiscriminate as required by humanitarian law;
- The Nuremberg Connection;
- The underlying principle that "nuclear might is right";
- NATO's nuclear umbrella doctrine;
- The planned use of "bunker busters" which would create the kind of environmental damage that should put nuclear weapons in the same stigmatized category as biological and chemical weapons.

Cdr. Green concluded that the development of new weapons such as "bunker-busters" is NATO's attempt to create "jobs for nukes" rather than to pursue its obligation to negotiate nuclear disarmament.

The Chair then introduced the second speaker, Professor Yves Le Boulhiller. Prof. Le Boulhiller elaborated on the substance of NATO's policy, specifically MC 4001, by referring to comments published in February 1997 by a member of NATO's planning committee. These were intended to "dispel myths about NATO's nuclear position." The NATO official said that