

NMD: Defence Against Threats – Keeping Stability

Using the Time Till Decision Taking For an Intensive Dialogue

Resolution of the National Committee of CDU Germany
for Foreign and Security Policies

(chaired by Dr. Friedbert Pflüger, Member of the German Bundestag)

(Courtesy Translation)

The danger of a large military confrontation has been drastically reduced since the end of the Cold War. A mutual nuclear attack of the USA and Russia is improbable today. Even after the fall of the Berlin wall the United States of America remain Germany's friend and partner and are indispensable for the political balance in Europe. Therefore a strong American presence in Europe is also in the future in our interest in spite of the construction of a European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP). The CDU is of the opinion that an active and strong role of the USA in Europe and in the world is indispensable also in the future. Germany and Europe must enter with the USA within the framework of NATO into a close and trustful dialogue over the new scenarios of threats and draw from such scenarios consequences in the field of security policy in order to be able to live up to such new threats.

This is necessary, because new threats have replaced the old confrontation between East and West. Even more states than the five nuclear powers recognised in the NPT-treaty strive for nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons as well as for technology for ballistic missiles, that could also endanger member states of NATO. The nuclear tests of India and Pakistan in 1998 as well as developments in the Near East have demonstrated before the whole world that proliferation of weapons of mass destruction have already become a real threat today.

Fanatic dictatorships or terrorists could acquire weapons of mass destruction. Therefore the demand was voiced in the USA that a limited National Missile Defence (NMD) and a Theatre Missile Defence (TMD, a system to protect one's own intervention troops), should be deployed in order to defend from a nuclear attack, but also in order to be able to contribute to a new nuclear balance of power on a lower

level. Only by the deployment of a NMD or a TMD the threats that America could be blackmailed by so-called states of concern or terrorists could be excluded.

The planned NMD contradicts, however, articles of the ABM-treaty (Anti-Ballistic-Missile Treaty) between the USA and the Soviet Union of 1972. In order to keep up the logic of deterrence the superpowers of the time, the USA and Soviet Union have laid down in the ABM-Treaty, that only two local missile defence systems in the USA and in the Soviet Union respectively may be deployed in order that a counter attack remains possible after a surprise attack. Even if the ABM-Treaty has lost of importance due to the changes of the international situation after 1989 and 1990, it is still an essential element of European stability and of the nuclear disarmament policy.

The 42nd American president Bill Clinton has postponed the decision on the construction of NMD on September 1, 2000. The US-President elected on November 7, 2000, can now free from the needs of winning an election ponder the advantages and disadvantages of NMD. He should make use of the time to lead an intensive dialogue with the NATO-allies and the international partners before he takes a final decision.

The following aspects should be taken into account:

- ? Russia has made it plain that an unilateral cancelling of the ABM-Treaty and the implementation of NMD would lead to a worsening of the relations to the USA and would limit the co-operation with the West and NATO in security policy affairs. Russia has threatened for example to re-introduced multiple nuclear war heads on ballistic missiles and to increase the degree of preparedness of the nuclear missiles.
- ? Beijing considers the deployment of a NMD-system as a security challenge to its own nuclear potential. China has begun independently of the American debate on NMD to modernise its nuclear strategic potential and keeps open the option to increase its nuclear strategic potential considerably beyond its present 20 long-range missiles.
- ? An armament of China could have negative effects on the security system in Asia and may lead to new dynamic armament on the Indian sub-continent.

- ? Studies point out that innovations with attack missiles could have overcome again and again by defence measures.

The CDU Germany proposes:

- ? The German government that has reacted to the American missile plans much too late and indiscriminate must form a common position together with the European partners in order to be able to influence stronger as hitherto the public opinion in the United States. In such a process the American perception of possible threats have to be made compatible with European considerations of stability and with a Transatlantic analysis of international security.
- ? The dialogue over a NMD must be carried out in a way that the cohesion of NATO will be further strengthened and the co-operation of the West with third parties primarily with Russia and China will not be endangered. This can be best achieved by a close consultation within NATO and by dialogue with third countries that takes justified interests into account. Thus a constructive dialogue on NMD can indeed lead to a situation in which the ABM-Treaty may lose in importance and may be in the final analysis no longer be needed, but not by a unilateral cancellation of the treaty, but by common agreement.
- ? It should be taken into account in such a dialogue in what respect the strategy of military deterrence could - besides prevention - be supplemented by technological possibilities of protection from missile attacks. Furthermore it should be examined, if by NMD not only protection for the USA, but also for the Europeans could and should be produced.
- ? The nuclear disarmament process, in which the CDU Germany takes a particular interest in, must be continued. Therefore it should be examined, whether the possibility of implementing a NMD could improve the chances for drastic nuclear disarmament measures by the USA and Russia.
- ? The West should work in close co-operation especially with Russia and China by diplomatic means on implementation of political, economic, and social reforms by so-called states of concern, at least however that such states take measures that reduce threats to international security.
- ? Preventive measures against proliferation of arms of mass destruction should be emphatically pursued. The strengthening of the whole regime of non-proliferation is a part of that, e.g. the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) must go finally into

effect. We should strive for a treaty on the prohibition of production of nuclear material that also could be used for the production of nuclear bombs (cut off). All diplomatic, political, and economic possibilities must be exploited to counter proliferation.

- ? It is also part of strengthening non-proliferation that those institutions which work against the proliferation of arms of mass destruction and missile technology should be better provided with organisational support and financial means. One step into this direction would be, if the USA paid its fees to the United Nations before long by which also the work of institutions are paid that control armament control agreements.