

Missile Defense Fraud

Continued from page 8

state of California, is considered a “rogue state” and “nation of concern” that threatens the U.S. military Goliath. The “be afraid” broken record from the commercial press goes like this:

“The threat of North Korean missile launches is one of the major reasons the U.S. is considering a limited national missile defense system”; “A declassified National Intelligence Estimate has predicted that a North Korean Taepodong II missile will be capable of hitting the U.S. by 2005”; “Development of the current missile defense system accelerated in 1998 after North Korea and Iran flight-tested primitive ballistic missiles”; “to defend against potential threats by such rogue nations as North Korea”; “Mr. Clinton’s self-imposed deadline is dictated by a growing threat from North Korea”; “The system is meant to protect the U.S. against emerging powers such as North Korea.”

Profiteering antimissile industries issue fearsome press releases and they fund sophisticated thinktanks that publish scary white papers, while financing congressional campaigns in exchange for billions in contracts. The World Policy Institute calculated that during the 1997-1998 campaign cycle, the four top missile-defense contractors — Lockheed Martin, Boeing, TRW, and Raytheon — spent \$34 million on lobbying and \$6.9 million in campaign contributions. The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, ICAN, issued a report in 2021 detailing the \$117 million spent by U.S. weapons contractors on lobbying Congress in 2020 alone. The leg work pays off with military contracts that are orders of magnitude greater than the cost of lobbying: as ICAN found in 2024, “Northrop Grumman and General Dynamics remain the biggest nuclear weapons profiteers, with outstanding contracts with a potential value of at least \$31 billion and \$24 billion respectively.”

While fear-mongering propaganda has convinced most that North Korea poses a danger, it has failed to convince a single NATO ally, the Group of Eight, Russia, or China. The General Accounting Office’s June 2000 report also questioned the “uncertain assessments of the potential threats” used to justify the expense of missile defense. In their letter to President Clinton, the 50 Nobel Laureates ridiculed the purported danger, posing the obvious question: “But what would such a state gain by attacking the United States except its own destruction?”

Indeed, North Korea has offered to scrap its long-range missile program if other countries launch two or three of its communications satellites a year from outside the country. This is exactly what the U.S. has previously demanded of Pyongyang. *The New York Times* editorial board has written that “the proposal merits serious consideration.”

Conclusion

It should be a matter of federal criminal investigation that between \$100 and \$400 billion has been lavished on weapons contractors for anti-ballistic missile schemes without producing a working program. Murphy, in *The Hill*, pointed to the self-defeating aspect of even continuing the program. “The very act of pursuing a missile defense system is already encouraging U.S. adversaries to expand their nuclear arsenals and develop additional technologies to circumvent missile defenses. So, counterintuitively, missile defense is making the world less safe.”

Continued funding of the needless, unworkable, gold-plated, and corrupt missile defense program amounts to larceny and theft. Rather than debating whether or not to give additional billions to the usual suspects, the Department of Justice should be assembling a grand jury.

To see sources and endnote citations for this article go to: <https://nukewatchinfo.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/Missile-Defense-Fraud-Goes-Ballistic-2025-UPDATE.docx>

NATO’s Nuclear Attack Threats

Continued from page 1

NATO’s Oct. 13 announcement had more gibberish: “Service members will rehearse the procedures related to the deployment of dual-capable [nuclear & non-nuclear] aircraft and the employment of conventional support assets in nuclear operations, ensuring all participating forces can coordinate effectively in a nuclear scenario.” Translation: We’re going to prepare for war using thermonuclear blasts, firestorms, and radiation.

Col. Daniel Bunch, Chief of Nuclear Operations at SHAPE, said to the press: “There is focus in ... getting the strikes planned, ... getting ... all of those elements synchronized to deliver...” Translation: Steadfast Noon’s purpose is to plan a complex, coordinated radioactive mass attack.

As if to put readers at ease, NATO said, “No live nuclear weapons will be used.” Evidently only dummies would be in the fighter jets.

The nuclear attack drill took place at Volkel Air Base in the Netherlands, Lakenheath base in England, Kleine-Brogel in Belgium, and Skrydstrup in Denmark, while Finland, Poland, the U.S., Germany, and others also dressed up as executioners.

The Netherlands Air Force recently debuted its newly purchased F-35A jet fighter-bombers which have been “certified” to carry the new U.S. B61-12 air-dropped H-bombs, which have reportedly now been stationed in Belgium, Netherlands, Italy, England, and Germany.

NATO’s annual exercise includes the use of non-nuclear aircraft, like surveillance planes, reconnaissance planes, refueling planes (for the long haul to Moscow), and giant KC-135 Stratotankers, all of which, according to NATO, “serve in a conventional support to nuclear operations.” Translation: “Nuclear operations” means attacking with uncontrollable, indiscriminate, poisoned warheads.

NATO’s inclusion of non-nuclear “support” personnel means the whole Air Force can share the ethical burden of risking the obliteration of civilization, so it isn’t carried only by the trigger men and pilots.

Is the planning and preparing of nuclear attacks sane, or is it suicidal ideation and madness?

No less an authority than Gen. George L. Butler (USAF Ret.), a former head of Strategic Air Command—which controls all U.S. nuclear weapons—has condemned all such nuclear attack preparedness, which he himself molded and rehearsed for years. Gen. Butler is the first SAC commander to reject and abandon nuclear “deterrence”—in dozens of speeches, articles, and a memoir Uncommon Cause—and to call for abolition.

Lambasting “the obscene power of a single nuclear weapon,” Gen. Butler wrote in the Fall 1996 and Spring 1999 journal of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation that the military’s nuclear attack plans are “a pernicious anachronism.”

Gen. Butler wrote, “Nuclear weapons are not weapons at all. They are insanely destructive agents of physical and genetic terror... They’re some species of biological time bombs whose effects transcend time and space, poisoning the Earth and its inhabitants for generations to come.”

NATO’s ceaseless nuclear attack threats were on parade in Europe, and its ring leaders talk as if they are rational. Gen. Butler, who is one of dozens of retired nuclear war planners who disagree, says, “Deterrence suspended rational thinking in the Nuclear Age.”

The commander denounced deterrence, in theory and practice, using words that could still stir desertion or mutiny among the nuclearists: “The likely consequences of nuclear war have no politically, militarily, or morally acceptable justification, and therefore the threat to use nuclear weapons is indefensible.”



NATO forces gather for the annual Steadfast Noon war games, including coordinating and rehearsing for nuclear operations. Photo: zuercher-presse.com.

Data Centers and Nuclear Moratorium

Continued from page 5

Minnesota, and that problem remains unresolved, especially in the face of a new nuclear boom.

The U.S. has more than 95,000 metric tons of high-level radioactive used nuclear fuel and has no long-term storage solution. The only attempted storage site at Yucca Mountain, Nevada had an estimated cost of \$96 billion. After spending \$8 billion and eighteen years, the project failed. Any repository would need to isolate radioactive waste from the environment for hundreds of thousands of years, requiring engineering beyond anything existing today and incurring maintenance costs generations beyond the operational life of any nuclear reactor.

According to Brice Smith, in his report for the Institute for Energy and Environmental Research, in the scenario of proposed expansion of nuclear power through 2050, in order to keep up with the production of high-level radioactive nuclear waste fuel, a new Yucca Mountain repository would need to open every three to six years to store the waste.

It is crucial now, more than ever, that states such as Minnesota maintain their nuclear moratoriums. These are the only guardrails to slow down data centers and the wholesale deployment of untested new nuclear technology. Without the moratoriums, there is an imminent threat that much of the funding meant to help transition the grid to renewable energy will be spent on nuclear infrastructure that is designed to serve the needs of tech giants, not the needs of the people.

Some, such as Minnesota Senator Spencer Igo, sponsoring legislation to repeal the moratorium, have suggested that the moratorium is impeding innovation in the nuclear power sector. To the contrary, according to a Congressional Budget Office report examining funding from 1948-2018, nuclear received three times more research and development funding than renewables and twice as much as fossil fuels. With the wealthiest and most technologically resourced people on the planet — and the federal government and U.S. military backing this industry it is hard to imagine any impediment.

Igo and others insist that removing the moratorium would only be in the service of using ‘all the tools in the toolbox’ and that regulators can be trusted to ensure only infrastructure that serves the public interest will be built. But time and again the NRC and Minn. Public Utilities Commission have been found to cater to the wealth of corporate utility shareholders who heavily lobby regulators. These regulators almost never deny applications.

Those who stand to gain from new nuclear deployment will scheme to see data centers and small reactors in towns across the country ahead of any large movement to stop them. Communities have already risen up to protect local water, the right to affordable energy, and the right to fight further consolidation of wealth. People everywhere must join the call to keep nuclear moratoriums, in fact to increase the number of them nationwide, in a stand against the railroading of the public by the wealthiest few. Just as Exxon lied about climate change science, the Silicon Valley influencers have been pushing nuclear as green in order to stage this very play, and now their aims are being laid bare.

Sources: U.S. Dept. of Energy; TechCrunch; Sierra Club; Forbes; Arjun Makhijani and Brice Smith, Institute for Energy And Environmental Research; Ed Lyman, Union of Concerned Scientists; Mark Jacobson, Stanford University; Reuters; National Academy of Sciences; Scientific American; S.F. No. 1706, Minnesota Session Laws; MPR News; KJZZ News; KCUR News