### “no first strike nuclear policy”

<https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2019-02-05/nuclear-first-strike-must-remain-an-option-for-america#xj4y7vzkg>

Countries have different uses for their nuclear weapons. In the case of the hypothetical involving North Korea, for example, few would expect India to have either the desire or the capacity to solve the North Korea problem. A “no first strike” nuclear policy thus might make sense for India, and indeed the country has adopted a version of such a policy. But as the world’s dominant military power, the U.S. is in a fundamentally different position.

<https://www.vox.com/world/2017/1/18/14310168/trump-nuclear-policy-inauguration-explained>

But when it came to Holt’s actual question, about his views on no first use as a policy, Trump had no real answer. He’s said both, “I would certainly not do first strike,” and, “I can’t take anything off the table” — but those are opposite things. The whole point of a no-first-strike policy is taking a first strike off the table. That means Trump literally had never heard of the no-first-use debate, had never thought about it enough to have an actual opinion, or didn't for some reason want to say that that opinion was.

<https://www.phillyburbs.com/story/opinion/columns/2017/08/18/nukes-cannot-be-option/18206717007/>

Sane, informed, levelheaded people know that continuing high-level diplomacy is the best way, maybe the only way, to avoid the risk of nuclear destruction. We must stop perpetuating the myth that we can fight nuclear wars. An essential first step is for Congress to establish a mandatory "no first-strike policy" for our military. Only the most powerful nation in the world can prevent nuclear war.

<https://www.nbcnews.com/id/wbna8587597>

China has a “no first strike” nuclear policy, but according to the Journal, Zhu said he believed that applied to non-nuclear powers and could be changed.

### “NFS” (vs. NFU)

#### What is “first-use”? (vs. “first strike”)

<https://nationalinterest.org/feature/the-case-retaining-the-first-use-doctrine-nuclear-weapons-17865>

Imagine that the United States detected an imminent conventional attack on South Korea. The United States might decide to launch a first strike on North Korea’s nuclear facilities to prevent it from using its nuclear weapons against South Korea. (A “first strike” usually refers to a nuclear strike like this one, in which one state launches a nuclear attack designed to eliminate the opponent’s nuclear arsenal. “First use” describes the use of nuclear weapons before the opponent has done so and could entail the use of smaller tactical nuclear weapons on the battlefield. In these terms, all first strikes constitute a first use of nuclear weapons, but not all cases of first use would be considered a first strike.) This would protect both South Korea and American troops on the peninsula from a nuclear attack. North Korea does not yet have a missile capable of delivering a nuclear weapon to the continental United States, so the immediate risk to the American homeland would be minimal in the event that the first strike failed to eliminate all of North Korea’s nuclear weapons.

#### --This is a decades-old distinction

<https://www.nytimes.com/1975/08/25/archives/first-use-first-strike.html>

There is a good deal of unnecessary contusion in this debate, particularly over the phrases “first use” and “first strike.” The former refers primarily to longstanding plans for employing tactical nuclear weapons against an overwhelming conventional attack as, for example, by Soviet forces in Central Europe. “First Strike” refers to an all‐out surprise attack by strategic nuclear forces—a kind of “nuclear Pearl Harbor.”