

February 25, 2005

Dear Member of Parliament:

Canada has made the right decision in saying no to missile defence. There will be continuing pressure, now and over time, to soften or gradually modify the position that our Prime Minister has announced. There are compelling reasons why Canada should not join or endorse the U.S. ballistic missile defence (BMD) scheme, and should continue to say no. There is mis-information and missing information in the press, and generally. In this brief we have assembled key, defensible, facts in a format that enables quick review. This information is acquired from highly credible sources and references can be provided.

The best interests of Canada

- Canada would be turning away from its longstanding policy of seeking security through multi-lateralism, international law, and disarmament treaties, rather than through military means
- Polls repeatedly show the majority of Canadians do not want Canada to join the U.S. BMD program
- Canadian involvement would produce no decision-making access to operation of the system, which would be run by the US Northern Command
- The US does not need our military commitment beyond the amended NORAD agreement, and seeks Canadian endorsement for political reasons.

Real dangers confronting Canada

- Weapons of mass destruction (WMD) are deliverable now - by bomber, cruise missile, cargo ship, railway, bus, or suitcase. BMD provides no protection against deliberate nuclear attacks by existing nuclear powers or nuclear terrorists and is designed only to intercept a few missiles launched in an isolated attack
- Canada needs to spend its resources on issues that are mutual priorities with the US, for example: the vulnerable nuclear reactors in North America, border security, anti-terrorism
- The missile defence system not only is useless but has triggered a new arms race, endangering all of us

Nuclear Proliferation

- Since the U.S. abandoned the ABM Treaty, Russia retains, on high alert, mobile MIRVed missiles with many nuclear warheads (Multiple Independently Targetable Re-entry Vehicles)
- Russia in December successfully tested an advanced road-mobile ICBM, the SS-27 Topol-M, capable of avoiding the BMD system through quick manoeuvrability
- China will expand its arsenal of 20 ICBMs to possibly 60 by 2006 and is developing BMD countermeasures as well as exploring ASAT capabilities

- U.S. policies for "Fortress North America" include: indefinite retention of nuclear weapons, research on new, smaller ones, first-use of them, and preventive war
- As a result, the U.S. and Russia have thousands of missiles on launch-on-warning, risking catastrophe by accident or technical failure

Disarmament

- The only real protection against missiles is disarmament -- get rid of them by treaty and verification
- For our protection, the Canadian government should pursue the Mayor of Hiroshima's 2020 Vision: elimination of nuclear arsenals, through treaty negotiations, by 2020
- Canada's leadership in seeking nuclear weapons abolition would be undermined and lack credibility. Joining the U.S. BMD program would align us with plans for a permanent nuclear weapons future

Ground-based interceptors (GBI)

- The GBI installed in Alaska and California are not operationally tested, and "successful" tests have been rigged
- Scientific studies by the American Physical Society, Union of Concerned Scientists, and Canadian Association of Physicists have shown fatal technical problems in the U.S BMD system
- The GBIs will not provide protection for Canadians -- or Americans

Space weaponization

- Endorsing BMD would be a major change in Canadian policy of opposition to space weaponization, including opposition to ASATs (AntiSatellite Weapons)
- The Department of National Defence has admitted that a significant risk associated with BMD is "its reinforcement of trends towards the weaponization of outer space"
- GBI missiles can be used as anti-satellite weapons
- Satellites are essential to telecommunications, the global positioning system, policing, verification of treaties, etc.
- Vital Canadian commercial ventures would be put at risk by the debris caused by ASATs
- The U.S 2005 budget included funds for research on space-based missile interceptor components, with deployment of a space-based weapons test bed to come in 2012
- The U.S. missile defence shield will be multi-layered and include not only space sensors but kinetic kill vehicles in orbit. The Near-Field Infrared Experiment (N-Fire) received \$68 million in funding in 2005; this satellite is scheduled for deployment in space by the U.S.Missile Defense Agency in 2006 and the design

includes a kill vehicle

- U.S. Space Command's Vision for 2020 (1997) and the U.S. Air Force Transformation Flight Plan (November 2003) show that the U.S. is seeking global domination by acquiring and using war-fighting capability in space
- By participating in the ground-based phase of BMD, Canada would be compromising its leadership for a ban on weaponization of space

Priorities

- \$1 trillion is the predicted cost of the U.S. BMD system. There will be "no free lunch" for Canada, and funding for BMD would have to be taken from essential international and domestic social programs.
- Where corporations receive US-based contracts, Canada would have to produce matching dollars for research and development
- Could contracts for corporations justify abandoning our moral credibility and years of work against nuclear weapons, robbing vital social programs, and risking the terror of weapons in outer space?

The big picture

Security through military strength is an anachronism. Today's weapons, available to rogue nations and terrorists are so powerful that defence is practically impossible; major wars will have no victors, only losers. Therefore, security through improved and enforced international law is the only rational and humane option. The BMD is part of the paradigm of security through military means and is therefore, in principle, not acceptable nationally or globally.

SUBMITTED – February, 2005, on behalf of

CANADIAN PUGWASH GROUP EXECUTIVE **AND **SCIENCE FOR PEACE BOARD OF DIRECTORS****

Dr. Adele Buckley, Chair , Canadian Pugwash Group (CPG); Member, Science for Peace

Phyllis Creighton, Member CPG and Board Member, Science for Peace

Dr. Helmut Burkhardt, Member CPG and Past President Science for Peace