

ated. “Missile threats by those countries which Americans and Europeans claim develop long-range missiles—it is just not credible. Europe should not feel vulnerable, and the issue is that Russia instead of Europe now feels vulnerable,” he asserted.

Orlov was backed up by France’s Director for Strategy Affairs and Defense Policy Michel Miraillet: “Firstly, Iran’s ballistic missile program threatens neither Europe or the United States. Secondly, the Iranian nuclear program is developed for civil applications only. Therefore Russia considers Iran is a risk, not a threat to Europe.” He also said, however, that it would be a risk to ignore Iran’s missile program, which is quite capable at shorter ranges.

Over 200 experts from 50 countries, including all 28 NATO members, as well as China, South Korea, Japan, and Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO) member states, participated in the conference. They are now all on notice, to act to prevent World War III.



NATO

*Russian Chief of Staff of the Armed Forces Nikolai Makarov heads a delegation to NATO, January 2010. Makarov warned at the recent conference that in view of deployment of the NATO BMD system, “a decision on the preemptive use of available offensive weapons will be taken during the period of an escalating situation.”*

---

## Documentation

---

# Russian Leaders Warn of Preemptive Strike on BMDS

*The following are excerpts from comments made by Russian officials at the May 3-4, 2012 conference in Moscow on anti-ballistic missiles (ABM) and the NATO ballistic missile defense system (BMDS). The quotes are from Interfax news agency and Vzglyad newspaper (translated by EIR).*

### Minister of Defense Anatoli Serdyukov:

“The defense capability of our country depends on solving this problem. . . . We want to show the potential and the prospects for mutually beneficial cooperation on ABM defense. We intend to set the conditions for developing such cooperation.”

At the present time, however, regarding the ABM negotiations:

“The situation is practically at a dead end.” When NATO on May 20 announces that the first phase of the Euro BMDS is operational, “that will mean that the USA and NATO intend to continue developing the BMDS without consideration of Russia’s concerns.”

“Recently it has been stated more and more frequently that it is fundamentally impossible to reach agreement on ABM issues. We do not agree with that. Despite all the difficulties, Russia and the USA were able to conclude the Strategic Offensive Arms Reduction and Limitation Treaty. That document clearly reflects the inseparability of strategic offensive weapons and anti-missile defense.”

### Secretary of the Russian Security Council Nikolai Patrushev:

“Russia shares the concerns of the world community about new upward spirals of missile proliferation. We do not think, however, that the current degree of these matches what the NATO countries prescribe for eliminating them.”

Patrushev went on to say that not a single one of the countries presenting possible problems from the stand-

point of missile proliferation has ICBMs, and that there is no evidence that ICBMs will appear in the near future.

He emphasized the refusal of the United States to provide legally binding guarantees that its BMDS would not be directed against Russia, saying that this casts doubt on what the real purpose of the system is:

“Legally binding guarantees are needed that the BMDS in Europe is not directed against Russia’s strategic nuclear forces. These should be backed up by objective criteria with respect to, in particular, the quantity and geography of interceptor missiles deployed, their velocities and ranges, and the capabilities of radar installations and other information systems for detecting ballistic missiles and aiming anti-missile missiles at them.”

According to Interfax, the Security Council secretary stated his certainty that the BMDS in Europe will lower the effectiveness of Russia’s deterrent: “The geographical regions and technical characteristics of these missile defense systems create the foundations for additional dangers, especially considering the current and future levels of U.S. high-precision armaments. There are simply no targets for the missile defense shield other than Russia.”

Patrushev also said:

“The optimal solution would be joint development of a concept for European ABM architecture that would strengthen the security of all countries of the continent without exception, would be adequate to the probable threats, and would not undermine strategic stability.”

#### **Chief of the General Staff Gen. Nikolai Makarov:**

“Considering the destabilizing nature of the BMDS, specifically the creation of the illusion of being able to inflict a disarming first strike without retaliation, *a decision on the preemptive use of available offensive weapons will be taken during the period of an escalating situation...* Deployment of new offensive weapons in southern and northwestern Russia, capable of firing on the anti-missile installations, and including the emplacement of Iskander missile units in the Kaliningrad Region, is one possible option for destroying the ABM infrastructure in Europe” (emphasis added).

Makarov stated that the current U.S. deployment plan for the BMDS in Europe is unacceptable, insofar



Press Service of the Russian Eastern Military District  
*Russian anti-aircraft defenses in the Republic of Buryatia.*

as it “covers the flight trajectories of Russian ICBMs.”

Makarov commented that the U.S. refusal to offer legally binding guarantees that the BMDS is not directed against Russia, may indicate that plans exist to use the system against Russian forces.

#### **Deputy Minister of Defense Anatoli Antonov:**

“Our task today is for this conference to enable us to narrow the abyss of mistrust or misunderstanding in this area. It is not likely that we shall reach agreement about anything. But I would greatly wish that when our colleagues gather [at the NATO summit later this month] in Chicago and make decisions on their next steps, they remember this conference and think seriously about where implementation of these ill-advised ABM plans could lead. . . . My hope is that the results of this conference will enable our Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Defense negotiators to get a feel for those elements on which agreement might be reached.”

#### **Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs spokesman Alexander Lukashevich:**

“I think that the signals sent not only by General Makarov, but also by other senior military officers, were intended to make the participants of the upcoming Chicago NATO summit understand the how serious the situation is and to reconfigure their thinking to take the Russian arguments into account in the further development of their BMDS.”