



**Humanitarian
Consequences of
Nuclear
Weapons**

PEACE NOW

A Bulletin from CNDP | Special Issue, November 2013

Coalition for Nuclear Disarmament and Peace



124 A/6, Second Floor
Katwaria Sarai
New Delhi-110067

www.endpindia.org
endpindia@gmail.com

011-26858940

In this issue

Catastrophic Humanitarian Consequences
of Nuclear Weapons

IPPNW

On the issue of Nuclear Terrorism

Achin Vanaik

Nuclear Weapons are Morally Indefensible

Admiral L. Ramdas

Hibakusha: Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Beyond

Robert Jacobs

Nuclear weapons must be eradicated for all our sakes

Desmond Tutu

Taking a Radioactive Bullet for the Team

Robert Jacobs

The Continuing Threat of Nuclear Weapons

David Kriegger

The Gravest Threat to World Peace

Noam Chomsky

Hiroshima Declaration, August 6, 2013

*This special issue of **PEACE NOW** is being brought out on the occasion of the National Conference on 'Abolishing Nuclear Weapons: Relevance for South Asia and the World' which CNDP is co-organizing with the International Campaign for Abolishing Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) and the India-Pakistan People's Forum for Peace and Democracy (PIPFPD).*

Sixty eight years after the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the world public remains deeply concerned at the scourge of these weapons of mass destruction, their inhuman nature and the menace they continue to pose to the survival of humanity. The end of the Cold War two decades ago undermined the always-dubious rationale of these instruments of mass extermination, but it did not abolish the weapons themselves. The global nuclear arsenal still comprises some 19,000 warheads and thousands of missiles, some of them ready to be launched at short notice, and enough to destroy the planet many times over.

Recent initiatives, including the High-Level Meeting at the United Nations General Assembly, and numerous civil society activities in different parts of the world, have highlighted the imperative of complete and universal nuclear disarmament in keeping with the global public's collective aspiration for preserving the planet for present and future generations. If chemical and biological weapons can be banned and abolished, so can nuclear armaments with their even greater potential for causing unacceptable harm.

There is a growing realization among citizens that it is necessary to generate public awareness and pressure worldwide in favour of achieving this goal by highlighting the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons, and hence the profound immorality of their possession and use. The case for banning the use of nuclear weapons through a legal treaty is unassailable.

Yet, the task of bringing about nuclear disarmament cannot be left to the leaders of the nuclear-armed nations alone. They have shown themselves to be more concerned with preserving and refining their nuclear arsenals and perpetuating the discriminatory global order of nuclear haves and have-nots, than with taking serious steps towards nuclear disarmament. Even efforts at promoting nuclear restraint measures, whether globally or regionally, have met with great obstacles in the form of the nuclear weapons-states' foreign policy and military ambitions.

The principal objective of the Conference is to highlight the urgent need to adopt a global treaty delegitimizing and outlawing nuclear weapons. As many as 151 non-nuclear weapons-states have supported the call for a treaty which bans the use of nuclear weapons. Some nuclear weapons-states also endorse the demand.

Such a treaty would strengthen the moral and political ground for demanding that concrete time-bound steps be taken towards the total and complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

Catastrophic Humanitarian Consequences of Nuclear Weapons

Nuclear weapons are the most destructive, most indiscriminate, most inhumane instruments of mass murder ever created. Their use—and even their possession—goes against every principle of international humanitarian law. In fact, it is likely that humanity could not survive a nuclear war using even a fraction of the arsenals in existence today.

The term “catastrophic humanitarian consequences” defines the unique and horrifying effects of nuclear weapons. The only natural events to which a nuclear explosion can be compared are massive earthquakes, hurricanes, volcanic eruptions, and similar disasters that result in thousands of casualties and cause catastrophic environmental damage. Unlike natural disasters, however, the consequences of nuclear weapons use—including lethal harm from radiation and climate disruption to millions of people who are not party to the conflicts in which they are used—are the result of human decisions. They can be prevented by a human decision to eliminate nuclear weapons and to ban them from ever being produced again.

The Medical, Environmental, and Humanitarian Facts

Why are nuclear weapons in a class by themselves, and why do we have to consider them separately from other weapons that kill and destroy on a large scale?

- First, even a single nuclear explosion over a city can kill tens of thousands — even hundreds of thousands — of people immediately. The casualties of a nuclear war in which even a small fraction of today’s arsenals are used would reach into the tens of millions.
- Second, nuclear weapons eradicate the social infrastructure required for recovery from conflict. Roads and transportation systems, hospitals and pharmacies, fire fighting equipment, and communications would all lie in rubble throughout a zone of complete destruction extending for miles.
- Third, nuclear weapons explosions have extreme and long-lasting environmental consequences, including disruption of the Earth’s climate and agricultural productivity.
- What makes nuclear weapons uniquely abhorrent is the ionizing radiation they release as a result of the uncontrolled chain reaction of

fissile materials. Exposure to ionizing radiation causes both acute (immediate) and long term health effects.

- Finally, there are numerous ways in which nuclear weapons cause extensive harm to health and the environment even if they are not used in war. The front end of the nuclear chain—the mining and processing of uranium that provides the fuel for nuclear weapons—has devastating health consequences for those who work in the mines and mills and for their families. There is also an enormous diversion of resources into the research and development, production, and deployment of warheads and their delivery systems, at the expense of real human and social needs that are inexcusably underfunded. World spending on nuclear weapons surpasses \$100 billion every year. By contrast, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute has estimated that it would take \$135 billion to fully achieve the Millennium Development Goals. Instead, each of the nine nuclear-weapons states is engaging in large, expensive programs to modernize its nuclear forces and to ensure that they will continue to endanger us all for decades to come.

The Diplomatic Context

At the five-year review of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 2010, the NPT member states said repeatedly that failure to act on nuclear disarmament risked “catastrophic humanitarian consequences.”

In November 2011, the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement also referred to catastrophic humanitarian consequences when it adopted a new resolution condemning nuclear weapons and calling for international agreements to prevent their use and to ensure their elimination. The resolution cited the 1996 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, which concluded that “The destructive power of nuclear weapons cannot be contained in either space or time. They have the potential to destroy all civilization and the entire ecosystem of the planet.”

In 2012, the humanitarian grounds for eliminating nuclear weapons became a focal point for States determined to accelerate the pace of disarmament. A group of 16 States submitted a groundbreaking joint statement on the humanitarian dimension of nuclear disarmament” at the NPT PrepCom in Vienna. Later in the year, 35 States, including the original 16, told the UN First Committee: “Nuclear weapons have the destructive capacity to pose a threat to the survival of humanity and as long as they continue to exist the threat to

humanity will remain. This, in addition to the perceived political value and prestige attached by some States to these weapons, are factors that encourage proliferation and non-compliance with international obligations. Moreover, it is of great concern that, even after the end of the Cold War, the threat of nuclear annihilation remains part of the 21st century international security environment.”

These 34 States, along with the Holy See, warned that the only way to ensure nuclear weapons are never used again is their “total, irreversible and verifiable elimination.”

Courtesy: International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW)

On the Issue of Nuclear Terrorism

Achin Vanaik

Sometime ago, at a nuclear summit of 47 countries in New York in 2010, President Barack Obama waxed eloquent on the extreme danger of fissile materials falling into the hands of groups like Al Qaeda which would then make and use a nuclear bomb. Mr. Manmohan Singh among others who had attended dutifully applauded this view of the dangers of non-state nuclear terrorism seeking only to put his own spin on the matter by indirectly pointing the finger at Pakistan as a collaborating culprit in this respect.

Given that the very nature of nuclear weapons discourse by nuclear weapons states (NWSs) is unavoidably

hypocritical and dishonest is it not time for a closer look at the apparently self-evident, and certainly self serving (to NWSs) claim that one of the great dangers today and tomorrow if not *the* great danger is that of nuclear weapons being built or falling into the hands of ‘terrorist groups’? One of the purposes and effects of this self-serving talk of nuclear terrorism, and hence its popularity and frequency, is that it legitimizes and excuses the NWSs themselves. It does this in a number of ways. First, it dramatizes the wholly artificial ‘divide’ between so-called responsible nuclear powers and supposedly irresponsible nuclear agents,

actual or potential. These irresponsible agents are of course selectively identified – among NWSs it is said to be Pakistan and North Korea; among aspirant states it is Iran and Iraq; among non-state aspirants it is supposed to be a range of Islamist groups.

Second, it covers up the indisputable historical reality that the global nuclear mess we are in is *wholly the responsibility* – in varying degrees – of the NWSs themselves. No notion of nuclear deterrence can justify the existing levels of deployment or stockpiles of nuclear weapons. Despite the end of the Cold War during which the idea of a BMD was actually abandoned, we now have an Obama administration which in continuity with previous post-Cold War US administrations is acting in ways which more than negate whatever mild forward steps are being taken on the nuclear front. US upgrading of existing weapons is endorsed as also the operations (with continued financial support) of the weapons laboratories. The determined long term development of the Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) system is clearly aimed at Russia and China but justified in the name of Iran and North Korea. There is no dismantling of warheads as distinct from their demating and stockpiling in the New START agreement. According to the US's latest Nuclear Posture Review, the nuclear pre-emptive option is restricted but not rejected, and its negative security assurances to non-nuclear states neither

universal nor unconditional. The Proliferation Security Initiative – a fraudulent and illegal initiative -- far from being discarded will be pursued in the name of fighting rogue states and terrorists.

Third, it diverts attention away from the fact that it is NWSs, above all the US (which is currently orchestrating the fight against 'nuclear terrorism'), that has the worst record of repeated attempts at nuclear blackmail and is the only country to have used nuclear weapons and to this day has majority domestic support for these two acts of nuclear terrorism in 1945. Since then it is not only the US and Russia that have come close to actually launching such weapons. Israel in 1973 came close to using such weapons against *non-nuclear* adversaries but for the fact that the tide turned on the conventional military-territorial front. The purpose of recalling this history is to point out that state actors have not only come close since the advent of the nuclear age to using nuclear weapons even against non-nuclear countries but that they can also be much more confident than non-state actors of getting substantial, even majority support from their citizens for such behaviour.

Fourth, this division between 'responsible' and 'irresponsible' and 'irrational' nuclear agents, when it comes to the issue of preventing proliferation is again quite fraudulent. All NWSs have

either proliferated know how and/or actively collaborated with other states in their efforts to develop nuclear weapons. This applies to early Sino-Soviet and US-UK collaborations. The UK continues to depend on US missiles and designing for fitting warheads to these imported missiles for its own 'independent' nuclear arm. France helped Israel which helped apartheid South Africa. There has been the China-Pakistan relationship. The US deliberately turned a blind eye to Israeli and Pakistani preparations. The Indian government has not proliferated to other countries but has simply cheated and betrayed its international commitments regarding dual-use technologies and materials – the 1974 Pokharan I test. Having so cheated it finally succeeded in getting away with this, indeed getting rewarded politically and materially via the NSG exception given to it as part of the Indo-US nuclear deal process. New Delhi which once railed against the nuclear dishonesties of the NWSs and their "club of nuclear apartheid", now that it has joined that same club is perfectly willing to play the same game of self-righteous and dishonest hypocrisy. What was important was not the existence of 'nuclear apartheid', i.e., discrimination between nuclear haves and have-nots but only the fact that India was not a beneficiary of that discrimination until it was able to join the club and of course thereafter to be able to pose as a 'responsible' nuclear power.

This new 'responsible' nuclear power of India will keep quiet about the record of its similarly 'responsible' nuclear allies such as the US and Israel even as it declares itself disturbed by any Iranian efforts to acquire the bomb since this Iranian effort would violate its NPT commitments (a treaty which India used to bitterly oppose) and other international commitments; all this from an India which in 1974 did not hesitate to do the same. Of course, a finger must be pointed at Pakistan's irresponsibility. How is the record of A.Q. Khan's proliferation activities to be understood? Does it break the pattern of states being responsible for proliferating behaviour mentioned earlier? It does not. States keen to develop the bomb can get support from other states and purchase materials from private markets as Iraq before 1991 was doing. The great difference between Pakistan and other NWSs (including Israel) is that it is the only one among this group whose civilian government has not been in full control of nuclear arrangements. In Pakistan, the military and not the civilian government, has been the key controller and supervisor over nuclear activities. It is this that gave A.Q.Khan's set up the autonomy it had and allowed it to act as a proliferator of know how and materials independent of the civilian apparatuses of the state but only with the permission and acceptance of key sections of the military and intelligence apparatuses. To pass off A.Q. Khan's set up and

behaviour as an exemplar of independent non-state activity is mistaken. Does this not indict the Pakistan state as an 'irresponsible' proliferator? Yes certainly, but no more so than in the case of other states from Israel to France to UK to US to Russia to China which similarly deserve indictments.

Fifth, insofar as nuclear weapons are 'weapons of terror' (which they are) nuclear deterrence is itself a terrorist doctrine sanctioning the possession, brandishment and preparations for use of nuclear weapons. The principal discourse that legitimizes the existence and therefore threatens the use of nuclear weapons is not any 'fundamentalist' interpretation of religious texts or 'irrational' eschatological visions but the very 'rationality' of nuclear deterrence thinking and the 'limited' nuclear war fighting doctrines that can logically enough flow from deterrence premises and arguments. Nuclear deterrence is not the simple registration of the idea that nuclear weapons can deter. It goes far beyond this because it is a theorization and rationalization that this property is so powerful and enduring that states can and should rely on it for achieving their security, where this notion of security is understood in the conventional and highly restricted sense of meaning military protection of territory. It is not nuclear weapons that *create* an 'existential situation of deterrence'. It is the doctrine of deterrence that is *created*

to justify the 'existential situation of the production, possession and presence of nuclear weapons'!

Sixth, the dramatization of the danger of nuclear terrorism by non-state actors derives whatever plausibility it has from two crucial assumptions which need to be seriously questioned rather than unthinkingly accepted. a) That there is a distinct category of persons/groups called terrorists to be distinguished from other collective agents e.g. 'responsible' or democratic states supposedly incapable of acting terroristically, although they might be at times guilty of 'human rights abuses.' b) That those who lead non-state groups or at least some of them, are far more dangerous than those who lead many a NWS because they are more irrational in their motivations and behaviour and therefore much more likely to use a nuclear bomb.

The first assumption is irredeemably flawed. Terrorism cannot be understood as a reference to any category of persons but is a reference to a technique, a tactic, a method involving intimidation and violence. When one seeks to identify what constitutes a terrorist act it is widely accepted that this is a premeditated or calculated act that threatens, or actually carries out, physical injury/deaths to innocent unarmed civilians. This is not an all-inclusive definition of terrorism that covers all its historically variable forms. But it is more than adequate for our

purposes here. Understood as such the terrorist act is undertaken by all kinds of agencies including the apparatuses of the state. It is the deliberated, the premeditated and calculated character of the act that makes it terroristic as distinct from a spontaneous or accidental action affecting civilians. Whether the act is undertaken with the *intent* to injure/kill civilians or whether the act is undertaken *knowing* that it will injure/kill civilians, the difference between these two states of mind is not significant either philosophically or morally for understanding the phenomenon of terrorism. Most states always claim that they never intend to hurt civilians even as they undertake actions that they know are going to do so. In both cases, the act remains a deliberated and calculated one carried out in full awareness of its negative, indeed immoral consequences. And the scale of civilian deaths caused by states on their own citizens or on the citizens of other countries overwhelmingly dwarfs those caused by the actions of non-state actors. This comparative judgement holds over any historical time period chosen.

Since terrorism refers to a tactic, a method, how on earth is it possible to wage a war on a technique? Yet dominant discourses continue to extend credibility to this absurdity and thus to endorse the US's fraudulent 'global war on terror' in which India is supposed to a responsible partner. The warning and war against 'nuclear terrorists' abetted by

certain nuclear possessing or aspiring states then becomes a 'natural' corollary of this overall war on terror.

In regard to the second assumption, those that lead non-state groups pursuing some political cause for which they are prepared to use violent means, *are no more and no less rational* than state managers taking decisions in pursuit of so-called national interests. Once it is accepted that nuclear weapons are acquired for some *consciously perceived purpose* then it is a rational act howsoever much one may reject or oppose or be horrified by that purpose. This is as true of Political Islam as of other groups inspired by their particular interpretations of religious and secular doctrines and visions. And in all forms of Political Islam it is the specifically political goals and objectives that are their driving force, howsoever shaped their social, cultural and economic programmes might be by variant understandings of Islam. The temptation to see 'fanatical' Jihadis as somehow more dangerously 'irrational' and 'extreme' in their *political* behaviour than say, slave-owning dynasts or colonizers embarked upon a civilizing mission or US imperialists out to finish off communist evil or fervent Hindutva-ites ruling India, is best avoided.

The political conflict between non-state and state actors, insofar as it has an armed and violent dimension is universally described as a form of

asymmetrical warfare. What is rarely if ever given the recognition it deserves is that in terms of the scale of suffering imposed (injuries and deaths of innocents and civilians) the terrorism of the strong (of states) – as all historical evidence indisputably and overwhelmingly confirms – far outstrips the terrorism of the weak (of non-state agents). The only way to remain blind to this historical and contemporary judgement is to use the magic wand of re-description. The terrorism of states (some of them) is said to be not really terrorism at all but something else, the usual substitute labels chosen being “law and order excesses” and “unavoidable collateral damage.”

The basic reason for this contrast in suffering imposed has little to do with the asymmetry of means of violence possessed by the two sides, which is obvious. Rather, it has much more to do with the fact that this very asymmetry allows for, and imposes, very different political compulsions and rationalities on the two sides with respect to the relationship between military means and political ends. State managers see themselves as being the only legitimate wielders of violence within the territories over which the state has jurisdiction. States as entities that are supposed to have a monopoly of legitimated violence over a given territory cannot tolerate any other entity carrying out violent actions within the domain over which they are supposed to have juridical control. The

more powerful the state, the more intolerable they are of any such actions. It is never the actual material damage done by such violent actions by non-state actors that most disturbs state managers, nor the extent to which the act erodes the capacity of the state to carry out its multifarious governmental functions or to retain its geographical boundaries. In this respect terrorist acts by non-state actors are essentially inconsequential.

The idea that 26/11 in India, the London and Madrid bombings, or 9/11 in the US represent a serious threat to the structures of democracy in these countries is frankly ludicrous. Claims that this is the case no doubt feature in the overblown rhetoric of state managers and in many supporting editorials of a largely supine media. But these are falsities whose purpose is to justify the ‘reactive’ policies and practices (often themselves anti-democratic) of the state to such events. For what is really at stake is the challenge that such events like 9/11 or 26/11, pose to the *authority* of the state. In the era of nation states, that authority rests more than ever it did in the past on an inescapably symbolic dimension of what today constitutes political power. It is here, in this fact of symbolism and its importance that there is an asymmetry of political impact that works against the materially far more powerful side, the state. The terrorism of the weak, of non-state actors, is above all an act of symbolic-communicative

politics aiming to weaken and undermine the authority of its opponent state, not its material-physical sources of power. In this respect for non-state actors the political impact to be got from a terrorist act is disproportionately high as compared to whatever material damage it might or might not do.

It is a politics on the cheap, the impact achieved being far more important than the means used. Nonetheless, there is always a cost-benefit rationality at work here too. The non-state terrorist act aims to do two things – invigorate the ‘home’ constituency that witnesses the public act; and simultaneously demoralize the enemy state and its support base. The scale, character and consequences of likely enemy response are also factored into this cost-benefit analysis. Precisely because Marxists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century grossly underestimated the power and significance of the symbolic-communicative dimension in the era of mass politics, they dismissed and denigrated the possible efficacy of such acts. The classical Marxist approach incidentally, prone as it was to a class-based moral relativism, criticized terrorism on grounds of inefficacy – ‘reformism with a gun’, a ‘substitute for mass mobilization’ – not on grounds of its immorality.

For states, the relationship between military means to be used and political benefits sought is very different. States

have to stamp their authority far more emphatically, unchallenged-ably and assertively than non-state agents that are not under any such compulsion given the very fact of being non-state entities. Asymmetric warfare means non-state agents do not and cannot aim to physically destroy states. They do not have the means nor do they need to strive to acquire such means. What they seek to do is to create the conditions whereby their state enemies lose not their capacity but their *will* to prevent the achievement of their objectives. (This is also the case in asymmetric warfare between states, e.g., the Vietnam War). By contrast, for states, the more powerful they perceive themselves to be, the more the affront to their sense of authority is the terrorism of the weak, the more determined they are to physically exterminate their non-state opponents, encased though they may be within their own catchment areas of popular support. The resort to much higher levels of violence in pursuit of this more extreme objective of physical extermination, becomes a logical, indeed rational feature of the behaviour of such powerful states. States are also much more able to get away with, that is, justify to a wider public, domestic and even foreign, such levels of violence. These have included the use of depleted uranium artillery shells, white phosphorus, oxygen sucking ‘daisy cutters’, Agent Orange and other chemical defoliants, even the use of nuclear weapons. All this means

that there exist far fewer restraints on their exercise of violence or military power.

The situation in which non-state terrorism takes place is quite different in respect of its contextual limitations, barriers and boundaries. The terrorist violence of non-state actors must not reach the point whereby it creates the conditions for legitimising a reactive assault of extreme intensity against its own popular base and by doing so deeply alienate that base. There is an important line of demarcation that exists. On one side are those actions by states that are widely seen as an unjustified 'overkill' that only further alienates the home constituencies of insurgent groups against the enemy state and strengthens support for non-state actors themselves. But this line is crossed when non-state actors engage in forms of action which by their very nature greatly widen the 'legitimacy space' for state reactions of great intensity and scope. There is thus a built-in proportionality in terrorist acts by non-state agents between means of violence used and the political gains sought from that act. The use of nuclear weapons by such groups, leaving aside the underestimated practical difficulties in making or assembling such a bomb, would be disastrously counter-productive politically speaking. Even the use of a 'dirty bomb' – dispersal of radioactive materials via a conventional chemical explosive – is highly unlikely even if higher up on the ladder of possibilities

than use of a nuclear bomb. The main target of such a dirty bomb, the US, would not hesitate to then resort to a nuclear attack against a designated territorial target, unjustified though this would be. And opponents of the US are not naive enough not to realise this.

As things stand, the US has not rejected the use of nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear adversary using chemical or biological weapons. One of the real dangers of these never ending alarms about nuclear terrorism is that it more strongly prepares the ground for a NWS – most likely the US – to carry out a 'limited' nuclear attack precisely to drive home publicly the message that no non-state group or network should have any doubts about US willingness to so behave and thus not even contemplate doing what the US itself has done – possessing, deploying and using nuclear weapons.

Forget trying to acquire a nuclear bomb, no insurgent group or non-state network has tried to poison a city's water supply or spray debilitating gases or chemicals over a suburban district from a chartered small plane, neither of which are particularly difficult to do. Even before the break-up of the USSR there was a private illegal market in radioactive materials and dual-use equipment and components. Involvement in this trade is for varied purposes and the end users are more often than not state apparatuses seeking to obtain materials

otherwise difficult or more expensive to get or make. To what extent agencies roaming independent of states are doing this and to what extent they are ultimately seeking 'private' possession and for what private purposes, remain obscure. Though there is little reason to jump to conclusions about the 'terrorist bomb', there is of course every reason to want to put in place controls to stop such clandestine activities. But this requires all states including of course all NWSs to come together and to be fully transparent and honest about their nuclear behaviour, and to stop being selective and hypocritical about the issue of non-proliferation. Ending such trade also cannot be divorced from the issue of regional and global disarmament and the refusal of the NWSs to seriously embark on such disarmament. If on one hand India is able to enhance its nuclear arsenal and capacities because existing international rules and norms in respect of such trading is shamelessly eroded (the exception made for it by the NSG under US pressure) then should anyone be surprised that a Pakistan determined to match India's rising capacities might seek to do so through illegal trading?

The hyped-up discourse on the enormous threat and danger posed by nuclear terrorism specifically and by non-state terrorism more generally is a deceitful and diversionary discourse that seeks to shift focus away from what is the primary problem – that of state terrorism in both its nuclear and non-

nuclear forms. There is of course an 'action-reaction' feedback relationship between the two kinds of terrorism. Recognition of this does not in any way detract from the necessity of condemning or trying to prevent non-state terrorism or of bringing its culprits to book. But this legitimate and necessary quest must not be allowed to ever divert us from the far more arduous and important task of exposing, condemning and trying to prevent state terrorism. This in turn requires establishing the mechanisms and procedures for adjudicating, sentencing and punishing the highest echelons among state managers. The International Criminal Court is a faltering and limited step in that direction. Much, much more needs to be done in terms of developments in national and international laws and in the building of related institutions. That is the kind of discourse that needs to be initiated and sustained globally. One is certain, the former Nobel Peace Prize winner, President Obama and the US will most definitely never take the lead in this regard.

[This is a revised version of an article that first appeared in a 2010 issue of the *Economic and Political Weekly*]

Nuclear Weapons are morally indefensible

Admiral L. Ramdas' message

Friends, I would normally have been personally present at this seminar, but am still convalescing after major heart surgery and therefore unable to join you. However I would like to share some thoughts and recap the shared journey that many of us have taken to get us to where we are today.

Let me begin on a personal note.

For a military man to be against Nuclear weapons is not only rare, but demands a kind of personal courage of ones convictions which is not easy, especially in an environment which has celebrated Nuclear weapons as synonymous with national pride and a pinnacle of technical achievement .

Coming out in public against India's decision to test the weapon in Pokhran, as I did in May 1998, was perhaps one of the toughest personal decisions of my life. Not only was I part of a service ethos where we were actively developing and operating Nuclear platforms at sea, but nuclear based military strategy was a central part of our overall doctrine of defensive and offensive warfare . My decision emerged largely out of, a deeply thought through pragmatic and ethical position. It also came partly as a result

of my decision to play a role in two groups both working for better relations with our neighbour Pakistan. These were the PIPFPD [Pakistan India Peoples Forum for Peace and Democracy], and IPSI –[India-Pakistan Soldiers Initiative for Peace]. Increasingly there was clarity in my mind that there could never be any military solution but political negotiations and better neighbourhood management alone which could resolve our boundary issues with our closest neighbours. In turn this would enable us in the region to drastically reduce our growing expenditure on defence and focus instead on pressing concerns of poverty, and all that flows from it.

It was but a natural transition to be a founding member of CNDP – Coalition for Nuclear Disarmament and Peace in 2000, after the Pokhran Nuclear tests. CNDP is a broad based coalition which sought to push the No Nukes and Peace agenda – not just in India but in the South Asian Region as a whole. My participation in both these sets of initiatives – the nuclear and peace with Pakistan - was seen by many as being anti-national, un-patriotic, even traitorous. My own comrades and brethren in the service preferred to keep

me at arms length for a long time, especially since my position on nuclear matters did not find favour with the government of the day!

Needless to say, the challenges along the road to Nuclear Disarmament, and for that matter, on Peace, have been many and tough. These will find place in a different narrative. What is noteworthy is that this group of academics, scientists, activists and citizens have managed to remain relevant, and continue to play an important watchdog role 15 years down the line, as a key, mostly lone, voice against Nuclear Weapons, and, increasingly against Nuclear Power, and for peace in the region. For the most part NGOs, citizens groups, political parties, have been reluctant to speak out forcefully against the nuclear option. Perhaps this has been dictated by the compulsions and faulty analysis, that being perceived as a nuclear state, was an integral part of India's national security. In addition the political leadership had packaged and marketed the view that a nuclear capable India was indeed the acid test of our indigenous technological progress. To criticise the bomb, indeed all things nuclear, was tantamount to being unpatriotic and anti national.

The debates, the pulls and pressures for and against nuclear weapons continue across the world and the hallowed halls of the UN to this date. The United States of America has fought wars on the often

questionable grounds of eliminating nukes and other weapons of mass destruction in countries like Iraq.

The cold war ended, but the massive arsenals of nuclear weapons continue to be a silent and menacing threat to both peace and the environment. It is as if the world is poised on the verge of taking some momentous decision on abolition – but has not the power of determination to actually go ahead and do it. This next step too requires a clarity of vision, courage, confidence and statesmanship of the highest order.

Mahatma Gandhi, during a speech in Pune in July 1946, referring to the dropping of the Bomb in Hiroshima had this to say: "*Non Violence is the only thing that the Atom Bomb cannot destroy. When I first heard that the atom bomb had wiped out Hiroshima, I did not move a muscle. I said to myself, unless the world now adopts nonviolence, it will spell certain suicide for mankind.*"

Despite India's stated philosophy and commitment to non violence, we were unable to exercise the global leadership that could have seen a major stride towards genuine peace and nuclear disarmament. In the early decades post World War II and the utterly shocking use of the nuclear weapon in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, India continued to oppose the testing and production of nuclear weapons. Unfortunately it was India who violated this commitment when the BJP government decided to carry out its overt

explosions at Pokhran on May 13, 1998. Predictably Pakistan responded with its own tests carried out at Chagai hills on the 28 of May. The irony is that the final result shows us that there have been no winners, and both our countries have ended up as losers!

However, it is noteworthy that it was Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi- addressing the third special session on Disarmament on 9 June 1988 who put forward an action plan for total nuclear disarmament.

The quotation below highlights the key features of the plan :

" First, there should be a binding commitment by all nations to eliminating nuclear weapons, in stages by the year 2010 at the latest. Secondly all the nuclear weapon states must participate in the process of nuclear disarmament. All other countries must also be a part of the process. Thirdly to demonstrate good faith and build the required confidence, there must be tangible progress at each stage towards the common goal. Fourthly, changes are required in doctrines, policies and institutions to sustain a world free of nuclear weapons. Negotiations should be undertaken to establish a comprehensive global security system under the aegis of the United Nations".

I was also part of an informal group, chaired by Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar,

which put in considerable time and effort to resurrect and update the Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan (RGAP). The report was submitted on 20 August 2011. Alas little progress has been made apart from the launch and a couple of meetings and public hearings.

Few will challenge the urgency and need to eliminate nuclear weapons and to see this as a priority for the nuclear weapons states to address seriously. Certainly for countries of the South Asian Region, overwhelmed as we are by major problems of poverty, of illiteracy and widespread environmental degradation, disarmament and peace on our borders is a major developmental and human security imperative. And it is for this reason that this seminar is both timely and important. The time is ripe for a renewed and invigorated push – nationally and globally - to power and strengthen this demand for a nuclear weapons free world.

In closing I would like to sum up why I will continue to oppose Nuclear weapons

*Nuclear weapons are
politically counterproductive
Economically a disaster,
Militarily ineffective, and
Ethically and morally
undefensible.*

Hibakusha: Hiroshima, Nagasaki and Beyond

Prof. Robert Jacobs

Hundreds of hibakusha gather in Hiroshima on August 6 every year, and in Nagasaki on 9 August. Many more will stay away from such commemorations, preferring to spend these anniversaries in private. Almost all of these hibakusha were children when their families were attacked with nuclear weapons: and it is these grown children who remain to bear witness.

While over 70,000 people were killed in Hiroshima on the day that the US dropped an atomic bomb on the city center in August 1945, even more people became survivors of that attack. Many tens of thousands would die in the coming weeks, months and years, but some would live long and full lives. Their lives would forever be marked by this experience. Many have never shaken the trauma of expecting that they would die, having watched their family and their friends die, having seen an endless horizon full of the dead and dying and the corpses of people and animals burned beyond recognition, and of seeing their homes and city disappear into fire and rubble.

Beyond the epidemiological and

psychological affects on the hibakusha, the social impacts were often as devastating. Experiencing discrimination in marriage and employment, many were also plagued by their own worries about whether to have children, and by anxieties that every subsequent cold or flu that they or their children experienced might be the first signs of an impending fatal illness. In a sense the nuclear attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki never ended.

While those who can testify to the experience of direct nuclear attack are shrinking in number to those who were children at the time, sadly, the world is still full of hibakusha who can testify to the rippling consequences of radiation exposure on health, family and community. Since the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the Trinity Test detonation a few weeks before them, there have been over 2,000 nuclear tests all across the planet—541 of these tests were conducted above ground. Atmospheric nuclear explosions deposited large amounts of radionuclides in nearby communities as well as downwind from the sites via radioactive fallout. Much of that fallout consisted of

alpha-emitting particles that remain radioactive from periods of several months to tens of thousands of years and cycle through the ecosystem for the period of their radioactivity. These nuclear tests, especially of large thermonuclear weapons (h-bombs) deposited immense quantities of radionuclides in areas surrounding nuclear test sites. As a result, millions of people were exposed to radioactive fallout. Many more have had their lives disrupted by their removal from their homes and the eroding of their traditions.

Atmospheric nuclear weapon tests have been carried out on all continents except for South America and Antarctica. Tens of thousands of nuclear testing hibakusha have been removed from their home villages, cities, atolls and islands, and have never returned. Others remain living, raising their children and their food in contaminated areas. Almost none have received any compensation for their health problems or loss of land. Some, like the villagers living nearby to the former Soviet nuclear test site in Kazakhstan, the Polygon, have been abandoned by both their perpetrator and newly formed home nations. Since both are newly formed countries, neither will take responsibility for removing these hibakusha from contaminated lands, or compensate them for the deaths of family members.

Nuclear testing hibakusha who have been removed from their home

communities have suffered the social breakdowns that result from dislocation from traditional lands and lifestyles. Many end up living as refugees in the lands of their neighbors, and suffer the loss of access to plots for farming, water access for fishing, and suffer the social stigma of being outsiders. The Bikinians of the Marshall Islands were ostracized in the atolls where the US military moved them to even though they experienced no exposure to radiation, because they were deemed foolish for giving up their home atoll, a consequence of forced removal rather than an actual choice.

Nuclear weapon testing is very closely connected to colonial history. Most nuclear powers test weapons either in the far reaches of their empires, or among marginalized populations in their own country. Partly as a result of this legacy, most of these communities remain in isolation from other test communities, and from the world at large. They often define themselves in relation to the colonial power that irradiated them, i.e., they are victims of French nuclear testing, of Soviet nuclear testing, of American nuclear testing, etc.... Often hibakusha from affected communities have no idea that there has been extensive nuclear weapon testing in other countries. As with so many legacies of colonialism, the nuclear testing related sicknesses, deaths and contamination of land suffered by hibakusha communities have benefited from little or no compensation and no

apology. The neglect with which the nuclear powers have treated them extends the damage and brutality, now an inheritance for generations.

Today we remember those who died, and those who have suffered as a result of the nuclear attack on Hiroshima. On Thursday we will remember those who died, and those who have suffered as a result on the nuclear attack on Nagasaki. These attacks resulted in unimaginable horrors that the rest of us cannot fathom. Let us also pause to think of the unknown millions who lost their lives, their health, their families, and their

communities to the thousands of nuclear weapon tests that were carried out with little thought of the human beings that were affected—subsumed under vainglorious dreams of nuclear superiority and victory in warfare. Let us pause to remember the nightmares those nuclear dreams spawned, and the legacy of death, illness and contamination they have left in their wake.

Prof. Robert Jacobs is Associate Professor at the Hiroshima Peace Institute, Hiroshima City University.

Nuclear weapons must be eradicated for all our sakes

Desmond Tutu

We cannot intimidate others into behaving well when we ourselves are misbehaving. Yet that is precisely what nations armed with nuclear weapons hope to do by censuring North Korea for its nuclear tests and sounding alarm bells over Iran's pursuit of enriched uranium. According to their logic, a select few nations can ensure the security of all by having the capacity to destroy all.

Until we overcome this double standard

– until we accept that nuclear weapons are abhorrent and a grave danger no matter who possesses them, that threatening a city with radioactive incineration is intolerable no matter the nationality or religion of its inhabitants – we are unlikely to make meaningful progress in halting the spread of these monstrous devices, let alone banishing them from national arsenals.

Why, for instance, would a proliferating

state pay heed to the exhortations of the US and Russia, which retain thousands of their nuclear warheads on high alert? How can Britain, France and China expect a hearing on non-proliferation while they squander billions modernising their nuclear forces? What standing has Israel to urge Iran not to acquire the bomb when it harbours its own atomic arsenal?

Nuclear weapons do not discriminate; nor should our leaders. The nuclear powers must apply the same standard to themselves as to others: zero nuclear weapons. Whereas the international community has imposed blanket bans on other weapons with horrendous effects – from biological and chemical agents to landmines and cluster munitions – it has not yet done so for the very worst weapons of all. Nuclear weapons are still seen as legitimate in the hands of some. This must change.

Around 130 governments, various UN agencies, the Red Cross and the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons are gathering in Oslo this week to examine the catastrophic consequences of nuclear weapons and the inability of relief agencies to provide an effective response in the event of a nuclear attack. For too long, debates about nuclear arms have been divorced from such realities, focusing instead on geopolitics and narrow concepts of national security.

With enough public pressure, I believe that governments can move beyond the hypocrisy that has stymied multilateral disarmament discussions for decades, and be inspired and persuaded to embark on negotiations for a treaty to outlaw and eradicate these ultimate weapons of terror. Achieving such a ban would require somewhat of a revolution in our thinking, but it is not out of the question. Entrenched systems can be turned on their head almost overnight if there's the will.

Let us not forget that it was only a few years ago when those who spoke about green energy and climate change were considered peculiar. Now it is widely accepted that an environmental disaster is upon us. There was once a time when people bought and sold other human beings as if they were mere chattels, things. But people eventually came to their senses. So it will be the case for nuclear arms, sooner or later.

Indeed, 184 nations have already made a legal undertaking never to obtain nuclear weapons, and three in four support a universal ban. In the early 1990s, with the collapse of apartheid, South Africa voluntarily dismantled its nuclear stockpile, becoming the first nation to do so. This was an essential part of its transition from a pariah state to an accepted member of the family of nations. Around the same time, Kazakhstan, Belarus and Ukraine also

relinquished their Soviet-era atomic arsenals.

But today nine nations still consider it their prerogative to possess these ghastly bombs, each capable of obliterating many thousands of innocent civilians, including children, in a flash. They appear to think that nuclear weapons afford them prestige

in the international arena. But nothing could be further from the truth. Any nuclear-armed state, big or small, whatever its stripes, ought to be condemned in the strongest terms for possessing these indiscriminate, immoral weapons.

Courtesy: The Guardian, March 4, 2013

Taking a Radioactive Bullet for the Team: How nuclear testing irradiates communities in the name of national security

Prof. Robert Jacobs

You people who live near the Nevada Test Site are in a very real sense participants in the Nation's atomic test program," boasted a propaganda pamphlet distributed to those living downwind from the American nuclear test site in Nevada in 1955. In the end this statement turned out to be more ominous than it was celebratory. Their primary means of "participation" in the nation's program was to be silent about being irradiated and having their land contaminated by fallout radiation from clouds that blew overhead after nuclear weapon tests for years. Of course that doesn't count paying high taxes for the gift of national security.

All across the globe communities have

been devastated by radiation in the name of giving the members of those communities "security." This is especially true of communities that suffered from the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, however, many of the communities that experienced underground testing, such as Pokharan (of which today is the anniversary of the first test there) experienced the venting of radiation from the underground shafts, contaminating areas near to the test sites. This was especially true of the French Bérly nuclear test in Algeria in 1962 in which the tunnel, drilled into a hillside, partially collapsed venting tremendous amounts of radiation that contaminated the surrounding communities.

While communities on every continent besides South America and Antarctica have experienced contamination from nuclear weapon testing, not one person has yet been “protected” by nuclear weapon testing. Arguments are made that vast nuclear arsenals have “deterred” nuclear war, but these arguments rest on assumptions and are as demonstrable as the notion that prayer produces miracles. What is certain is that the communities that have been the sites of nuclear weapon testing have experienced radiological contamination and that this has led to illness, loss of access to land and seas, disruption of traditional diets, traditional lifestyles, and ruptures of culture. In Australia where aboriginal societies were displaced by British nuclear testing in the 1950-60s, generations of knowledge of the land—where to find water and game—were broken when communities were simply moved off of traditional lands. Survival in areas in which ancestral knowledge did not guide and protect these communities proved extremely difficult. But as (barely) Australians and members of the Commonwealth, their safety was supposedly guaranteed by these tests. In truth there never was a threat to the safety of people living in Australia that was protected by the British testing of nuclear weapons. Rather, it was the testing itself that destroyed communities and left land desolate.

In all nations that have built, tested and maintain nuclear arsenals, those arsenals have taken essential resources away from the maintenance of social welfare. In the United States, arguably the richest country in history during the period of the Cold War, the dominance of

public tax monies by the nuclear weapon complex, and the military as a whole, has left the country depleted of social wealth in a few short decades. During the early Cold War period there were times when 10% of all electricity was being used to build, maintain and deploy nuclear weapons. Did this protect the nation, or did it cost the citizens? I would argue that the pursuit of nuclear weapons by any nation is an attack on the welfare of the citizenry in terms both of the public cost, and in antagonizing the neighbors and enemies of the nation. It is clearly true that possessing nuclear weapons has not kept any nation from becoming embroiled in warfare, and has proved useless once war commences. For those who live close to nuclear weapon testing sites, either domestically or in the colonial reaches of the nuclear power, the tests themselves have been a kind of warfare wagged upon them directly by their own governments.

Like the crown jewels of nobility past, nuclear weapons are a vast commitment of public wealth to the purpose of dazzling observers. Nuclear *prima donnas* display their expensive, glittering weapons to establish status and dominance. If we are lucky the cost to the citizens who pay for this is only money. But for those who live near to the nuclear testing facilities of the exclusive club of nuclear states, the cost is higher. They pay with their health, their families, their communities, and uncertain futures that accompany contaminated lands and gene pools.

Prof. Robert Jacobs is Associate Professor at the Hiroshima Peace Institute , Hiroshima City University.

The Continuing Threat Of Nuclear Weapons

David Krieger interviewed by *Leslee Goodman*

Goodman: How many nuclear weapons are there in the world today?

Krieger: Far too many. Nine countries have a total of almost twenty thousand nuclear weapons. More than 90 percent are in the arsenals of the United States and Russia. The remaining weapons are divided among the United Kingdom, France, China, Israel, India, Pakistan, and North Korea.

The U.S. has far more nuclear weapons deployed — 1,800 — than there are reasonable targets, especially considering that Russia is more than nominally our friend and China is one of our major trading partners. And we retain thousands more in reserve.

Goodman: Why so many?

Krieger: You'd have to ask the U.S. government, which has been reluctant to commit to a nuclear-weapons ban because it has found the arms useful for imposing its will on other nations. We can threaten, "Do as we say, or else." I see this as an extraordinarily dangerous gambit, however, as we may be challenged to make good on our threat. The potential consequences of using nuclear weapons are so horrendous that *any* risk of their use is too high.

Goodman: The number of nuclear weapons has fallen from a peak of

seventy thousand in 1986. Are the numbers still going down?

Krieger: Yes, they are still going down. The world has shed fifty thousand nuclear weapons since the 1980s. That's a terrific accomplishment. But it's not enough, especially given that the U.S. and its nato allies made no commitment to further nuclear-arsenal reductions when they met in 2012. And nato reaffirmed its commitment to nuclear weapons at its 2012 summit in Chicago.

The only number that is truly significant is zero, and, more than twenty years after the end of the Cold War, the nuclear-armed countries still have no real plan to get there.

Gandhi, when asked about the U.S. using nuclear weapons against Japan, said that we could see the effect on the cities that were destroyed, but it was too soon to know what effect the bomb would have on the soul of the nation that used it. In many respects the soul of America has been compromised. We can't go on developing ever more powerful weapons indefinitely. Those of us born at the onset of the nuclear age are challenged in ways unknown to previous generations, because we grew up in a world in which humans have the capability to destroy everything. If the taboo on nuclear use in warfare, which has existed since 1945, is broken, the consequences could be eight thousand

years of civilization coming to an end and a radio-active planet. One nuclear weapon dropped on New York City could be sufficient to destroy the U.S. as a functioning nation. But it's not too late. We still have the capacity to walk back from the brink.

Goodman: Why is there not a greater sense of urgency today about the need to reduce nuclear arsenals?

Krieger: Nuclear weapons have been sold to the public as a necessary protection against nuclear attack. People have bought into the theory of deterrence — the idea that the fear of nuclear retaliation will keep the peace between the nuclear-armed powers. But a terrorist organization could still use a nuclear weapon and leave no way to retaliate because it has no discernible territory. And if just having nuclear weapons actually protects us, then why do we design so-called missile-defense systems to shoot down intercontinental ballistic missiles? We are planning for nuclear war as if it were winnable, not unthinkable. That is not rational.

Another reason for the seeming lack of concern is that too many people defer to experts. I think it is important for the public to reclaim the issue, as happened in 1982, when a million people gathered in New York's Central Park to support a freeze on nuclear buildup.

Goodman: What is the difference between long-range nuclear weapons and tactical nuclear weapons? Are the two kinds equally important to eliminate?

Krieger: Long-range weapons are also called "strategic" nuclear weapons and have intercontinental-delivery

capabilities. They can be launched from silos, submarines, or aircraft. Tactical nuclear weapons are smaller, with a limited range and generally less explosive power. Strategic weapons can do the most damage, but tactical weapons are more likely to get into the hands of terrorist organizations.

The U.S. has already eliminated most of its tactical arsenal, but it retains some 180 tactical nuclear weapons in five European countries: Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Turkey. Russia still has some three to four thousand of them. I believe that strategic and tactical nuclear weapons are equally important to eliminate. My goal is zero nuclear weapons on the planet.

Goodman: What message does the U.S. send the rest of the world by maintaining such a large arsenal of nuclear weapons?

Krieger: As long as the U.S. and other powerful nations claim to need nuclear weapons for security, it encourages additional countries to do the same. If the most powerful nation on the planet needs nuclear weapons, why wouldn't every country need them? The more nuclear weapons there are, the greater the chance that they will end up in the hands of extremist groups or an irrational leader who will one day decide it is in his or her country's national interest to use them.

Goodman: Is the U.S. likely to use nuclear weapons again?

Krieger: I certainly hope not, but so long as the weapons exist in the U.S. arsenal, there remains the possibility that they will be used. Most Americans would probably be surprised to discover that the U.S.

has never had a policy of “no first use.” We have given some countries “negative security assurances” — that is, promises that we won’t attack them with nuclear weapons — but we give this only to nations that do not have nuclear weapons and that we believe are in compliance with the Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1970, a treaty that aims, in part, to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. Countries that possess nuclear weapons or that the U.S. believes are out of compliance do not receive such assurances.

Goodman: So we say that nuclear weapons are too dangerous to use, but we will not commit to not using them.

Krieger: Actually, we don’t officially say that nuclear weapons are too dangerous to use. U.S. leaders reserve the right to use them under certain circumstances. If the U.S. were to adopt a no-first-use policy — and then get all the nuclear-armed countries to make the same pledge, with legal consequences for violation — it would be a significant step toward nuclear disarmament. But that doesn’t fit the policy of deterrence.

General George Lee Butler, who was once in charge of all U.S. strategic nuclear weapons, writes, “Nuclear deterrence was and remains a slippery intellectual construct that translates very poorly into the real world of spontaneous crises, inexplicable motivations, incomplete intelligence, and fragile human relationships.” This is a denunciation of the very principle by which countries justify their possession of nuclear weapons.

The policy of mutual assured destruction may have been successful during the

Cold War between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, but it came close to ruinous failure. The decision makers in the Cuban Missile Crisis have said on many occasions that there was an enormous amount of misinformation and misunderstanding. They were later shocked to discover how much they didn’t know and how fortunate we were to avoid a full-out nuclear exchange between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Goodman: Still, there has been no use of nuclear weapons for sixty-seven years.

Krieger: We should not take too much comfort in that, because it’s a relatively short period in human history. That rationalization is analogous to a man who, having jumped from the top of a hundred-story building and fallen sixty-seven stories without a problem, thinks everything is fine.

Also, you can’t prove that nuclear deterrence is the reason there hasn’t been a war. I could say with just as much certainty that the reason there hasn’t been a nuclear war is because people drink Coca-Cola. Correlation is not causation. We don’t know if both the U.S. and the Soviet Union having nuclear weapons prevented nuclear war. What we do know is that we came close to having a nuclear war on at least one occasion.

Goodman: But the nuclear era is the longest period of peace between great powers in history.

Krieger: It has resulted in numerous proxy wars, however. During the Cold War, conflicts were sparked by the power rivalry between the U.S. and the Soviet

Union, and after the fall of the Soviet Union, the major nuclear powers' continued pursuit of hegemony in critical regions of the world has caused much violence. Millions of people, primarily in poorer countries, have been the principal victims. Consider the wars in Vietnam, Afghanistan, and Iraq, among many others.

Goodman: What are your biggest fears in regard to nuclear weapons?

Krieger: I worry that humanity is stumbling toward its own extinction, and that the U.S. is leading the way. Americans don't want to have to deal with the serious implications of our nuclear policy. We like to stay "above the fray," which is the position of a pilot who drops the bomb. We want to keep the discussion on a technological or intellectual level and not deal with the terrifying possibility of the extinction of the human species and other complex forms of life on the planet. We don't want to consider what it means to live in a society that bases its security on threatening to murder hundreds of millions of innocent people.

Goodman: How many detonations would it take to end all life on the planet?

Krieger: I don't think anyone can answer that with certainty, but surely the U.S. and Russia each have enough thermo-nuclear weapons to accomplish it, should either country use them by accident or intention. Scientists have modeled what would happen if there were a relatively "small" nuclear war between India and Pakistan, involving fifty Hiroshima-sized bombs each on the other side's cities. Those hundred nuclear weapons would, in addition to the destruction of the cities,

put enough soot into the upper stratosphere to reduce the sunlight reaching the earth's surface, decreasing temperatures, shortening growing seasons, causing crop failures, and leading to hundreds of millions of deaths, perhaps a billion, by starvation caused by famine. Using all or most of the deployed strategic nuclear weapons in the U.S. and Russian arsenals, perhaps even some smaller number of these weapons, could reduce temperatures to below freezing on most of the agricultural land in the northern hemisphere and result in the extinction of humans and other forms of complex life.

Goodman: If terrorists were to detonate a single nuclear bomb in a major U.S. population center, how might it affect life in the entire country?

Krieger: Hundreds of thousands, even millions, of people would die from the blast, more would die from the fires the blast would cause, and still more would die from the radiation poisoning, as happened in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The detonation of a single nuclear bomb in New York City could be a thousand times worse than the 9/11 tragedy. It's difficult to imagine the full psychological impact, but people throughout the country would be stunned and frightened about which city might be next. The long-term cleanup and reconstruction would be overwhelming. What would we do in response? Would we pick a country we felt was responsible and destroy one or all of its cities? And we are talking here about only one bomb setting all of this in motion.

Goodman: How great is the risk of an accidental nuclear war?

Krieger: It's above zero, and any number other than zero is too great a risk. I also know that the more countries that develop nuclear weapons, the greater the risk of inadvertent nuclear war. Accidents happen, no matter how careful we are. The Russians thought they had control of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant. The operators were going through a routine exercise, and before they knew it, they had a meltdown on their hands. The Japanese thought they had control at the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant before the tsunami hit. Human fallibility and natural disasters are always with us. A computerized training program could lead to the false belief that we are really under attack, as has happened before. Or a nuclear submarine could lose communication with the command structure or misinterpret a command. In 1995 a U.S.-Norwegian launch of a weather satellite was mistaken by the Russians as a missile attack aimed at Moscow. Boris Yeltsin was awakened in the middle of the night and told Russia was under attack. He had only a few minutes to decide whether or not to launch a "counterattack" against the U.S. Fortunately, Yeltsin took longer than the time allotted to him, and it became apparent that the satellite was not a rocket aimed at Moscow.

There are many other examples of accidents that could have triggered nuclear detonations but didn't. There have been midair refueling problems where nuclear weapons have fallen from planes, and planes have crashed with nuclear weapons onboard.

Goodman: I presume we don't fly nuclear-armed airplanes over foreign soil.

Krieger: I believe that is our policy, but such incidents have occurred inadvertently. I can't say with certainty whether it's the policy of other nuclear-armed nations.

Goodman: As a young adult you spent nearly a year in Japan and visited the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. How do you respond to the common belief that the atomic bombs dropped on Japan in August 1945 saved lives by ending the war?

Krieger: It's interesting that, after the war, the number of lives supposedly saved by the bomb kept going up and up. At first they talked about 250,000. Within a relatively short time it was up to a million: I would say that's a myth. The *U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey*, published in 1946, concluded that, even without the atomic bombs, and even without the Soviet Union entering the war in the Pacific, the fighting would have ended in 1945 without an Allied invasion of Japan. Japan had put out feelers to surrender, and the U.S. had broken Japan's secret codes and knew about its desire to surrender, but we went ahead and bombed Hiroshima and Nagasaki anyway. Admiral William D. Leahy, the highest ranking member of the U.S. military at the time, wrote in his memoir that the atomic bomb "was of no material assistance" against Japan, because the Japanese were already defeated. He went on to say that, in being the first to use the bomb, the U.S. "had adopted an ethical standard common to the barbarians of the Dark Ages. I was not taught to make war in that fashion, and wars cannot be won by destroying women and children."

It's interesting that, after the war, the

number of lives supposedly saved by the bomb kept going up and up. At first they talked about 250,000. Within a relatively short time it was up to a million.

Goodman: How close is Iran to developing nuclear weapons?

Krieger: Iran's nuclear program has been under scrutiny by the International Atomic Energy Agency (iaea), and there is no evidence at this point that the Iranians have a nuclear-weapons program. They are enriching uranium to 20 percent u-235. You must enrich uranium to higher levels — 80 to 90 percent u-235 — to have the fissile material necessary for constructing nuclear weapons. But they could enrich to that level in the future, so it's important to keep an eye on the situation. It would be reprehensible, however, to initiate an attack against Iran simply because it could *potentially* create highly enriched uranium.

There's been a subtle shift in the way information about Iran is being conveyed to the American people. The government has gone from talking about the danger of Iran "obtaining" nuclear weapons to talking about the danger of Iran having nuclear-weapons "capability." Many countries have nuclear-weapons capability without possessing nuclear weapons. Germany and Japan are two. The Scandinavian countries, as well as Brazil and Argentina, probably have the means to make nuclear weapons, but they don't have them.

U.S. foreign policy might actually be pushing Iran toward a nuclear-weapons program. Iranians may view threats from the U.S. and Israel as dangerous to their sovereignty and well-being. George W.

Bush described an "Axis of Evil" composed of Iran, Iraq, and North Korea. Iraq gave up its nuclear-weapons program, and the U.S. invaded, overthrew its government, and executed its leader. Meanwhile North Korea developed nuclear weapons, and the U.S. continues to negotiate with its leaders. If you were the leader of Iran and observed what's gone on with the other two members of the so-called Axis, which path would you take?

Goodman: Iran is led by a fundamentalist regime that many view as being of dubious sanity. Shouldn't we worry about their having even nuclear-weapons *capability*?

Krieger: They may be of dubious sanity, but that can be said of many regimes. There have been many leaders, in the U.S. and elsewhere, who have acted irrationally at times. If, in fact, Iranian leaders are insane and irresponsible, of course they should not have nuclear weapons. But they also should not have them even if they are perfectly sane. No one should.

By the way, the Iranian situation points out a problem in the Non-Proliferation Treaty itself. A nuclear-power program gives a nation the ability to produce fissile materials for nuclear weapons, but Article iv of the Non-Proliferation Treaty refers to nuclear power as an "inalienable right." Is there really such a "right" to nuclear power? How can we promote nuclear power and nuclear disarmament simultaneously? Personally, I would like to see us rethink the role of nuclear power in the world, because there is such a close connection between the nuclear fuel cycle and the ability to make nuclear weapons.

Goodman: What should U.S. policy be toward Iran?

Krieger: First, we should propose that Iran put the enriched uranium created by its nuclear plants under the safeguards of international inspectors. I think Iranians would accept this. Really, any process that creates fissile materials should be put under strict international control. That includes nuclear power in the U.S.

Second, we should continue to apply sanctions to Iran if it does not allow full inspections of its nuclear fuel cycle.

Third, U.S. policy needs to be in accord with the promise we made in 1995 to pursue a nuclear-weapons-free zone in the Middle East, and we cannot have that without the participation of Israel. It is almost universally believed that Israel has a relatively large nuclear arsenal, even though it does not admit to it.

There are successful nuclear-weapons-free zones in a number of regions: Antarctica, Latin America and the Caribbean, the South Pacific, Southeast Asia, Africa, Central Asia and Mongolia. Virtually the entire southern hemisphere is composed of nuclear-weapons-free zones. There have been calls for such a zone in Northeast Asia, to include North and South Korea, Japan, parts of China, and the U.S. fleet in the region. But nuclear weapons are a global problem, and regional solutions will not be sufficient. We need to have a global set of negotiations to achieve a new treaty for the phased, verifiable, irreversible, and transparent elimination of nuclear weapons.

Goodman: Why do we need a new

treaty? What's wrong with the existing one?

Krieger: The existing Non-Proliferation Treaty calls for nuclear disarmament, but that goal hasn't been effectively pursued by its nuclear-armed member states — the U.S., Russia, the UK, France, and China — nor pursued at all by the other four nuclear-armed countries that are not parties to the treaty: Israel, India, Pakistan, and North Korea. In fact, North Korea withdrew legally from the treaty in its "supreme interests." We need a treaty that bans the possession of nuclear weapons and provides a road map by which we can move to a world without them.

A starting point would be a commitment by all nuclear-armed nations to a no-first-use policy. Step two would be major reductions in the nuclear arsenals of the U.S. and Russia — down to, say, two or three hundred weapons on each side. This is still far too many, but it would bring those nations into rough parity with the other nuclear powers in the world. After that, a new treaty to ban nuclear weapons could be negotiated.

I hope the leadership to move toward a nuclear-free world will come from the U.S. It appeared there was potential for this when President Obama said in Prague in 2009 that America seeks "the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons."

But even if we have leaders who are ready to lead on this issue, there will still need to be broad public support. Many Americans remain convinced that nuclear weapons provide security when, in fact, they act as a dangerous provocation and an incentive for

proliferation.

The path to security doesn't lie in keeping a stash of nuclear weapons for ourselves and preventing other countries from getting any. It's hypocritical to say that the U.S. should have these weapons and Iran shouldn't. It also creates resentment and a greater desire to possess them. The path to security can only be through total nuclear disarmament. We cannot indefinitely maintain a world of nuclear haves and have-nots, and we cannot go attacking every country that we think might be on the path to making a bomb.

Goodman: Do you think the U.S. will go to war with Iran to prevent it from developing nuclear weapons?

Krieger: The U.S. isn't prepared for the consequences of attacking Iran. Iran is much bigger and better organized than Iraq, where our troops fought for nine years. There is no telling how long it would take to subdue Iran or to deal with the consequences throughout the Middle East — and the world.

If we attacked Iran, it would harden the resolve of its leaders and those of other countries to develop nuclear arsenals so they wouldn't be attacked in the future. Remember our bellicose behavior toward Iraq and our conciliatory behavior toward North Korea. And Iran is a proud country; probably nothing would be more effective in uniting Iranians around their current regime than a U.S. or Israeli attack against them.

An attack would also be viewed as a violation of international law, an act of "aggressive warfare." In the Nuremberg trials after World War II, aggressive

warfare was one of the three crimes for which the leaders of the Axis powers were tried and convicted. Many were hanged. U.S. leaders committed the same crime in Iraq, and I would say in Afghanistan too.

Goodman: And in Pakistan, Syria, and Yemen with drone attacks?

Krieger: If some country sent drones to attack our leaders or citizens, I'm sure we would call that "aggressive warfare." But when we do it, for the most part it goes unremarked upon in the mainstream media. Few Americans are clamoring for accountability from our leaders.

Goodman: We have already proven we are not afraid to institute regime change, as we have done in Iraq and as we did in Iran in the 1950s. Is that our intention in Iran today?

Krieger: That would not be the intention of saner minds. Iran is in the mess it's in now as a result of our meddling in Iranian affairs sixty years ago by overthrowing its democratically elected prime minister Mohammad Mosaddegh. When you overthrow regimes, there are always unintended consequences. Iran and Iraq were frequent rivals and fought a long war in the 1980s. By overthrowing Saddam Hussein in Iraq, we shifted the power balance in the Middle East toward Iran. If we overthrow Iran's regime, there may be something worse in store for us.

The U.S. should do what it can to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries, but it shouldn't do it by military means. That would only undermine our own security.

Goodman: Is total disarmament realistic? Assuming we can't put an end to war, isn't it natural for all sides to want the biggest and best weapons?

Krieger: Not necessarily. Imagine you are one of our early human ancestors, and you have a choice among several sizes of club. You don't want one that is too thin and will break, but, at the same time, a fallen oak tree will be too big to handle. You want a piece of wood the right size to carry around and use.

Today the U.S. military needs weapons that can be used efficiently and that don't destroy indiscriminately. For quite some time there have been laws of warfare against weapons that fail to discriminate between soldiers and civilians. International humanitarian law also forbids weapons that cause unnecessary suffering, such as bullets that expand inside the body and rip out organs, and chemical and biological weapons.

Goodman: Are there any examples from history of a country voluntarily giving up its military advantage?

Krieger: It depends what you mean by "military advantage." The countries that signed the Biological Weapons Convention and the Chemical Weapons Convention saw greater military advantage in all countries giving up the weapons than in retaining the weapons for themselves. Many countries have agreed to a ban on land mines and cluster munitions, although the U.S. has not.

Goodman: Let's say we do achieve total nuclear disarmament, but then a rogue nation builds a nuclear weapon. Wouldn't this destabilize global relations?

Krieger: No, any treaty that would get us to zero would have safeguards against a country breaking out. To go from twenty thousand to zero nuclear weapons we'll need a verifiable process based on inspections in all countries. After we finally reached zero, the act of developing a nuclear weapon would be akin to breaking a taboo, and the countries of the world would rise up in protest and retaliation against the treaty breaker. And one nuclear bomb would not be sufficient to defeat a country like the U.S., even if the U.S. had no nuclear weapons, because our conventional forces are so powerful.

To have an effective disarmament plan, we will also need to institute nonmilitary ways of resolving conflicts so that the elimination of nuclear weapons does not create a world that is safer for conventional warfare. All countries want security, and the strongest guarantee of security is a system in which conflicts are resolved without violence. This is what is set forth in the United Nations Charter. The use of force, except in cases of self-defense or upon authorization of the UN Security Council, is prohibited. Unfortunately the permanent members of the Security Council have not fulfilled their responsibilities to keep the peace. Nor have they fulfilled their responsibilities to pursue negotiations in good faith for nuclear disarmament.

Goodman: Does the 2010 New START treaty with Russia effectively reduce nuclear stockpiles or is it just a pr tactic?

Krieger: It's both. It is not reducing our stockpile much more than the Moscow Treaty did, which George W. Bush signed in 2002. The New START treaty

will reduce the number of deployed nuclear weapons to 1,550 on each side and the number of deployed delivery vehicles to 700 on each side. But it also allows for modernizing the arsenals. It is a means of managing nuclear arms rather than a commitment to achieving a world without nuclear weapons.

Whether it is going to be an effective stepping stone to further cuts is questionable, particularly because the U.S. has been pursuing the deployment of antiballistic missile defenses up to the Russian border in Eastern Europe, and the Russians are very upset about this.

Goodman: What are antiballistic missiles?

Krieger: They are missile defenses that theoretically can take down offensive nuclear missiles in the air before they reach their targets. If only one side has them, that nation could believe it's able to launch a preemptive first strike and then use its defense missiles to avoid retaliation. It's really imagining a worst-case scenario, but that's the way military planners think.

For thirty years we had an Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty with the Russians, signed by Richard Nixon, which limited the number of antiballistic missiles that either side could deploy. That treaty was unilaterally abrogated by George W. Bush in 2002. In 2012 the U.S. made attempts to place missile defenses in Eastern Europe along the Russian border, supposedly to guard against an Iranian attack. It's as if the Russians put their missile-defense system on the U.S.-Canadian border and said to the U.S., "Don't worry. It's aimed at Venezuela." We would not be reassured.

Goodman: What is the cost of maintaining our current nuclear arsenal?

Krieger: Through the middle of the last decade, the U.S. had spent \$7.5 trillion on nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. The annual figure now is \$50 to \$60 billion for the U.S. and \$100 billion for all nuclear-weapons states. So the world is currently spending about \$1 trillion a decade on modernizing and maintaining nuclear arsenals.

Clearly, with our federal debt crisis and the extent of global poverty, we can't afford to spend this money. Nuclear weapons are relics of the Cold War. What possible scenario would require us to have a few thousand nuclear weapons ready to be fired at a moment's notice?

Goodman: Tell me about your civil resistance in February 2012.

Krieger: I have worked for peace and nuclear disarmament for most of my adult life, but it was only recently that I joined in civil resistance to a Minuteman iii missile launch from Vandenberg Air Force Base. These unarmed test launches aren't publicized much, but they occur regularly. I joined others in protesting at Vandenberg because the Minuteman iii missile is a first-strike weapon. The 450 Minuteman iii missiles in the U.S. arsenal are always on high alert, ready to be fired within moments. In a period of extreme tensions between the U.S. and Russia, each side would have an incentive to launch such land-based missiles so that they could not be destroyed in their silos. This is a dangerous and thoughtless carry-over from the Cold War. It was foolish then, and it is even more so now.

The routine missile test launches from Vandenberg use the Marshall Islands as targets. Imagine if the situation were reversed and the Marshall Islands tested missiles in the ocean off the California coast, putting our marine habitats and cities at risk. The Marshall Islands were our trust territories after World War II, and we abused that trust by conducting sixty-seven atmospheric and underwater nuclear tests there over a period of twelve years. It was the equivalent of exploding one and a half Hiroshima-sized bombs daily for those twelve years. The Marshallese people still suffer serious health problems from those tests, and they have not been compensated fairly for the wrongs done to them. By contaminating their islands with radiation, we have taken from them not only their health and well-being but their sacred land.

Goodman: The web address for the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation is www.wagingpeace.org. What does “waging peace” mean to you?

Krieger: “Waging peace” means that peace is active, not passive. You can’t sit back and wait for peace to come to you. You must work for it. You must shake off your apathy and demand it. This is not always easy in a culture of war, such as we have in the U.S., but it is necessary.

It is clear that war makes great demands on its participants. We need to think of peace in the same way. Peace is not the absence of war or the space between wars; it is a goal to be achieved by actively demanding that the world’s governments find nonviolent means of settling disputes.

Goodman: Hasn’t war been with us

since the beginning of humanity?

Krieger: There is no good anthropological evidence that war existed before the advent of agriculture. At the dawn of human history, it took all the able-bodied adults in a tribe to hunt and gather food. Agriculture enabled specialization, and with specialization came organization and hierarchy and leaders who wanted to increase their territory and wealth through military means. So civilization opened the door for warfare. Military service was encouraged through a system of rewards; soldiers received a portion of the spoils for doing the bidding of the leaders — if they didn’t die in battle. Smart politicians tell soldiers that they are fighting for a noble cause, no matter how ignoble it actually is, and smart military leaders reward their soldiers well to maintain their loyalty and thus increase their own power. Warfare is a socially conceived way of settling disputes, or expanding territory, or gaining riches without working for them.

Goodman: So you don’t believe human beings are warlike by nature?

Krieger: I don’t. Humans have a fight-or-flight instinct that resides in the reptilian portion of our brains. When threatened or trapped, we can go berserk. But the vast majority of the time we don’t behave this way. We must be taught to be warlike. It isn’t easy to get humans to kill each other in war. It requires considerable training, the primary goal of which is to get young people to identify with their fellow soldiers. It also takes considerable societal propaganda to dehumanize the enemy. Militarized societies take advantage of the loyalty and trust of recruits and turn them into killers.

Goodman: You emphasize the need for peace leadership training. Why is it important?

Krieger: Many Americans are complacent because they feel helpless to bring about change. We need to train and empower people. If someone wants to be a soldier, there are institutions that will train that person for war — the rotc, military academies, the army, navy, and air force — but if you want to work for peace, there are few places to obtain training. We need more institutions to provide opportunities for people to make a career of peace.

Peace leadership is not based on hierarchy. It must be leadership by example. A peace leader must demonstrate kindness and compassion, resolving conflicts nonviolently. Peace leadership also requires organizing, research, public speaking, working with the media, and expressing oneself with sincerity. The most important trait of a peace leader, though, is a passion for achieving peace, because that passion will be reflected in all that one says and does. It will attract others to the cause. Great peace leaders, such as Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr., were also courageous.

Wars could not exist without the support of the people, particularly the young people who must fight in them. The old antiwar slogan “What if they gave a war and no one came?” reminds us of this. If young people would not participate in wars, there could be none. I don’t think there are contemporary political leaders anywhere who would go out and fight wars themselves. They rely upon the young to do the killing and dying.

Goodman: Is the nuclear threat a greater threat than climate change?

Krieger: That’s like asking if you’d rather be executed by a firing squad or an electric chair. Both nuclear war and climate change can destroy human civilization.

Goodman: You often quote physicist Albert Einstein, who said that human survival in the nuclear age requires us to change our “modes of thinking.” What do you think he meant?

Krieger: Einstein worried that we would remain stuck in our old warlike modes of thinking, which, in the nuclear age, would lead to “unparalleled catastrophe.” He believed that nuclear weapons made it necessary to abolish warfare altogether and find nonviolent means of resolving our differences. Nations can no longer solve their problems in a warlike manner; they need to use cooperative means.

Goodman: You have said that investing our defense dollars in foreign aid would make us safer. Can we really buy friends that way?

Krieger: Calling it “buying friends” sounds patronizing to me. It trivializes the miserable conditions that much of the world lives in — without adequate food, water, shelter, education, and healthcare. You call it “buying friends,” but a better word for it is *justice*. And, yes, I think it is a far more effective strategy for national security than threatening or killing people in war. Moreover, it is the humane and ethical thing to do. Because we spend hundreds of billions of dollars building up our military, we use force when a conflict comes along, rather than being generous

with our resources and trying to help people. Large numbers of humans live in dire poverty while a small percentage live with obscene riches. If we want to prevent war and ensure the survival of the human species, we need to change this.

We could also prevent war by improving education and reducing poverty in *this* country. Many young people who join the military do so to get an education or find a better livelihood. If they had more alternatives, fewer of them **WOULD** turn to the military. Some enlist out of a sense of

patriotism, of course, so we also need to teach children that we are members of a single species. We should pledge our allegiance to humanity itself and to our incredible planet. This is the key to creating peace and bringing the nuclear age to an end.

Courtesy: wagingpeace.org

The Gravest Threat to World Peace

Noam Chomsky

Reporting on the final U.S. presidential campaign debate, on foreign policy, The Wall Street Journal observed that "the only country mentioned more (than Israel) was Iran, which is seen by most nations in the Middle East as the gravest security threat to the region."

The two candidates agreed that a nuclear Iran is the gravest threat to the region, if not the world, as Romney explicitly maintained, reiterating a conventional view.

On Israel, the candidates vied in declaring their devotion to it, but Israeli officials were nevertheless unsatisfied. They had "hoped for more 'aggressive'

language from Mr. Romney," according to the reporters. It was not enough that Romney demanded that Iran not be permitted to "reach a point of nuclear capability."

Arabs were dissatisfied too, because Arab fears about Iran were "debated through the lens of Israeli security instead of the region's," while Arab concerns were largely ignored – again the conventional treatment.

The Journal article, like countless others on Iran, leaves critical questions unanswered, among them: Who exactly sees Iran as the gravest security threat? And what do Arabs (and most of the

world) think can be done about the threat, whatever they take it to be?

The first question is easily answered. The "Iranian threat" is overwhelmingly a Western obsession, shared by Arab dictators, though not Arab populations.

As numerous polls have shown, although citizens of Arab countries generally dislike Iran, they do not regard it as a very serious threat. Rather, they perceive the threat to be Israel and the United States; and many, sometimes considerable majorities, regard Iranian nuclear weapons as a counter to these threats.

In high places in the U.S., some concur with the Arab populations' perception, among them Gen. Lee Butler, former head of the Strategic Command. In 1998 he said, "It is dangerous in the extreme that in the cauldron of animosities that we call the Middle East," one nation, Israel, should have a powerful nuclear weapons arsenal, which "inspires other nations to do so."

Still more dangerous is the nuclear-deterrent strategy of which Butler was a leading designer for many years. Such a strategy, he wrote in 2002, is "a formula for unmitigated catastrophe," and he called on the United States and other nuclear powers to accept their commitment under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) to make "good faith" efforts to eliminate the plague of

nuclear weapons.

Nations have a legal obligation to pursue such efforts seriously, the World Court ruled in 1996: "There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control." In 2002, George W. Bush's administration declared that the United States is not bound by the obligation.

A large majority of the world appears to share Arab views on the Iranian threat. The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) has vigorously supported Iran's right to enrich uranium, most recently at its summit meeting in Tehran last August.

India, the most populous member of the NAM, has found ways to evade the onerous U.S. financial sanctions on Iran. Plans are proceeding to link Iran's Chabahar port, refurbished with Indian assistance, to Central Asia through Afghanistan. Trade relations are also reported to be increasing. Were it not for strong U.S. pressures, these natural relations would probably improve substantially.

China, which has observer status at the NAM, is doing much the same. China is expanding development projects westward, including initiatives to reconstitute the old Silk Road from China to Europe. A high-speed rail line connects China to Kazakhstan and

beyond. The line will presumably reach Turkmenistan, with its rich energy resources, and will probably link with Iran and extend to Turkey and Europe.

China has also taken over the major Gwadar port in Pakistan, enabling it to obtain oil from the Middle East while avoiding the Hormuz and Malacca straits, which are clogged with traffic and U.S.-controlled. The Pakistani press reports that "Crude oil imports from Iran, the Arab Gulf states and Africa could be transported overland to northwest China through the port."

At its Tehran summit in August, the NAM reiterated the long-standing proposal to mitigate or end the threat of nuclear weapons in the Middle East by establishing a zone free of weapons of mass destruction. Moves in that direction are clearly the most straightforward and least onerous way to overcome the threats. They are supported by almost the entire world.

A fine opportunity to carry such measures forward arose last month, when an international conference was planned on the matter in Helsinki.

A conference did take place, but not the one that was planned. Only nongovernmental organizations participated in the alternate conference, hosted by the Peace Union of Finland. The planned international conference was canceled by Washington in

November, shortly after Iran agreed to attend.

The Obama administration's official reason was "political turmoil in the region and Iran's defiant stance on nonproliferation," the Associated Press reported, along with lack of consensus "on how to approach the conference." That reason is the approved reference to the fact that the region's only nuclear power, Israel, refused to attend, calling the request to do so "coercion."

Apparently, the Obama administration is keeping to its earlier position that "conditions are not right unless all members of the region participate." The United States will not allow measures to place Israel's nuclear facilities under international inspection. Nor will the U.S. release information on "the nature and scope of Israeli nuclear facilities and activities."

The Kuwait news agency immediately reported that "the Arab group of states and the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) member states agreed to continue lobbying for a conference on establishing a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction."

Last month, the U.N. General Assembly passed a resolution calling on Israel to join the NPT, 174-6. Voting no was the usual contingent: Israel, the United States, Canada, Marshall Islands,

Micronesia and Palau.

A few days later, the United States carried out a nuclear weapons test, again banning international inspectors from the test site in Nevada. Iran protested, as did the mayor of Hiroshima and some Japanese peace groups.

Establishment of a nuclear weapons-free zone of course requires the cooperation of the nuclear powers: In the Middle East, that would include the United States and Israel, which refuse. The same is true elsewhere. Such zones in Africa and the Pacific await implementation because the U.S. insists on maintaining and upgrading nuclear weapons bases on islands it controls.

As the NGO meeting convened in Helsinki, a dinner took place in New York under the auspices of the Washington

Institute for Near East Policy, an offshoot of the Israeli lobby.

According to an enthusiastic report on the "gala" in the Israeli press, Dennis Ross, Elliott Abrams and other "former top advisers to Obama and Bush" assured the audience that "the president will strike (Iran) next year if diplomacy doesn't succeed" – a most attractive holiday gift.

Americans can hardly be aware of how diplomacy has once again failed, for a simple reason: Virtually nothing is reported in the United States about the fate of the most obvious way to address "the gravest threat" – Establish a nuclear -weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Courtesy: Truth-Out.org

Hiroshima's Peace Declaration

August 6, 2013

We greet the morning of the 68th return of “that day.” At 8:15 a.m., August 6, 1945, a single atomic bomb erased an entire family. “The baby boy was safely born. Just as the family was celebrating, the atomic bomb exploded. Showing no mercy, it took all that joy and hope along with the new life.”

A little boy managed somehow to survive, but the atomic bomb took his entire family. This A-bomb orphan lived through hardship, isolation, and illness, but was never able to have a family of his own. Today, he is a lonely old hibakusha. “I have never once been glad I survived,” he says, looking back. After all these years of terrible suffering, the deep hurt remains.

A woman who experienced the bombing at the age of 8 months suffered discrimination and prejudice. She did manage to marry, but a month later, her mother-in-law, who had been so kind at first, learned about her A-bomb survivor’s handbook. “‘You’re a hibakusha,’ she said, ‘We don’t need a bombed bride. Get out now.’ And with that, I was divorced.” At times, the fear of radiation elicited ugliness and cruelty. Groundless rumors caused many survivors to suffer in marriage, employment, childbirth—at every stage of life.

Indiscriminately stealing the lives of innocent people, permanently altering

the lives of survivors, and stalking their minds and bodies to the end of their days, the atomic bomb is the ultimate inhumane weapon and an absolute evil. The hibakusha, who know the hell of an atomic bombing, have continuously fought that evil.

Under harsh, painful circumstances, the hibakusha have struggled with anger, hatred, grief and other agonizing emotions. Suffering with aftereffects, over and over they cried, “I want to be healthy. Can’t I just lead a normal life?” But precisely because they had suffered such tragedy themselves, they came to believe that no one else “should ever have to experience this cruelty.” A man who was 14 at the time of the bombing pleads, “If the people of the world could just share love for the Earth and love for all people, an end to war would be more than a dream.”

Even as their average age surpasses 78, the hibakusha continue to communicate their longing for peace. They still hope the people of the world will come to share that longing and choose the right path. In response to this desire of the many hibakusha who have transcended such terrible pain and sorrow, the rest of us must become the force that drives the struggle to abolish nuclear weapons.

To that end, the city of Hiroshima and the more than 5,700 cities that comprise

Mayors for Peace, in collaboration with the U.N. and like-minded NGOs, seek to abolish nuclear weapons by 2020 and throw our full weight behind the early achievement of a nuclear weapons convention.

Policymakers of the world, how long will you remain imprisoned by distrust and animosity? Do you honestly believe you can continue to maintain national security by rattling your sabers? Please come to Hiroshima. Encounter the spirit of the hibakusha. Look squarely at the future of the human family without being trapped in the past, and make the decision to shift to a system of security based on trust and dialogue. Hiroshima is a place that embodies the grand pacifism of the Japanese Constitution. At the same time, it points to the path the human family must walk. Moreover, for the peace and stability of our region, all countries involved must do more to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free North Korea in a Northeast Asia nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Today, a growing group of countries is focusing on the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons and calling for abolition. President Obama has demonstrated his commitment to nuclear disarmament by inviting Russia to start negotiating further reductions. In this context, even if the nuclear power agreement the Japanese government is negotiating with India promotes their economic relationship, it is likely to hinder nuclear weapons abolition. Hiroshima calls on the Japanese government to strengthen ties with the governments pursuing abolition. At the ministerial meeting of the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative next spring in Hiroshima, we hope Japan

will lead the way toward a stronger NPT regime. And, as the hibakusha in Japan and overseas advance in age, we reiterate our demand for improved measures appropriate to their needs. As well, we demand measures for those exposed to the black rain and an expansion of the “black rain areas.”

This summer, eastern Japan is still suffering the aftermath of the great earthquake and the nuclear accident. The desperate struggle to recover hometowns continues. The people of Hiroshima know well the ordeal of recovery. We extend our hearts to all those affected and will continue to offer our support. We urge the national government to rapidly develop and implement a responsible energy policy that places top priority on safety and the livelihoods of the people.

Recalling once again the trials of our predecessors through these 68 years, we offer heartfelt consolation to the souls of the atomic bomb victims by pledging to do everything in our power to eliminate the absolute evil of nuclear weapons and achieve a peaceful world.

Kazumi Matsui

Mayor
The City of Hiroshima

Nagasaki Peace Declaration

August 6, 2013

Sixty-eight years ago today, a United States bomber dropped a single atomic bomb directly over Nagasaki. The bomb's heat rays, blast winds, and radiation were immense, and the fire that followed engulfed the city in flames into the night. The city was instantly reduced to ruins. Of the 240,000 residents in the city, around 150,000 were afflicted and 74,000 of them died within the year. Those who survived have continued to suffer from a higher incidence of contracting leukemia, cancer, and other serious radiation-induced diseases. Even after 68 years, they still live in fear and suffer deep psychological scars.

Humankind invented and produced this cruel weapon. Humankind has even gone so far as using nuclear weapons on both Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Humankind has repeatedly conducted nuclear tests, contaminating the earth. Humankind has committed a great many mistakes. This is why we must on occasion reaffirm the pledges we have made in the past that must not be forgotten and start anew.

I call on the Japanese government to consider once again that Japan is the only country to have suffered a nuclear

bombing. At the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference, held in Geneva in April 2013, several countries proposed a Joint Statement on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons to which 80 countries expressed their support. South Africa and other countries that made this proposal asked Japan to support and sign the statement.

However, the Japanese government did not sign it, betraying the expectations of global society. If the Japanese government cannot support the remark that "nuclear weapons [should never be] used again under any circumstances," this implies that the government would approve of their use under some circumstances. This stance contradicts the resolution that Japan would never allow anyone else to become victims of a nuclear bombing.

We are also concerned about the resumption of negotiations concerning the Japan-India Nuclear Cooperation Agreement. Cooperating on nuclear power with India, who has not signed the NPT, would render the NPT meaningless as its main tenet is to stop the increase of the number of nuclear-weapon states.

Japan's cooperation with India would also provide North Korea, which withdrew from the NPT and is committed to nuclear development, with an excuse to justify its actions, hindering efforts toward the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.

I call on the Japanese government to consider once again that Japan is the only country to have suffered a nuclear bombing. I call on the Japanese government to enact the Three Non-Nuclear Principles into law and take proactive measures to exert its leadership by creating a Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone, thus fulfilling its duty as the only nation to have suffered an atomic bombing.

Under the current NPT, nuclear-weapon states have a duty to make earnest efforts towards nuclear disarmament. This is a promise they've made to the rest of the world. In April of 2009, United States President Barack Obama expressed his desire to seek a nuclear-free world during a speech in Prague. In June this year, President Obama stated in Berlin that he would work towards further reduction of nuclear arsenals, saying, "So long as nuclear weapons exist, we are not truly safe." Nagasaki supports President Obama's approach.

However, there are over 17,000 nuclear warheads still in existence of which at least 90% belong to either the United

States or Russia. President Obama, President Putin, please commit your countries to a speedy, drastic reduction of your nuclear arsenal. Rather than envisioning a nuclear-free world as a faraway dream, we must quickly decide to solve this issue by working towards the abolition of these weapons, fulfilling the promise made to global society. There are things that we citizens can do to help realize a nuclear-free world other than entrusting the work to leaders of nations only. In the preface of the Constitution of Japan, it states that the Japanese people have "resolved that never again shall we be visited with the horrors of war through the action of government." This statement reflects the firm resolution of the Japanese people to work for world peace. In order not to forget this original desire for peace, it is essential to impart the experiences of war and atomic devastation to succeeding generations. We must continue to remember war has taken many lives and caused the physical and mental anguish of a great many more survivors. We must not forget the numerous cruel scenes of the war in order to prevent another one.

People of younger generations, have you ever heard the voices of the hibakusha, survivors of the atomic bombings? Have you heard them crying out, "No more Hiroshimas, no more Nagasakis, no more wars, and no more hibakusha"?

You will be the last generation to hear their voices firsthand. Listen to their voices to learn what happened 68 years ago under the atomic cloud. Listen to their voices to find out why they continue to appeal for nuclear abolition. You will find that, despite much hardship, they continue to fight for nuclear abolition for the sake of future generations. Please consider whether or not you will allow the existence of nuclear weapons in the world today and in the future world of your children. Please talk to your friends about this matter. It is you who will determine the future of this world.

There are many things that we can do as global citizens. Nearly 90% of Japanese municipalities have made nuclear-free declarations to demonstrate their residents' refusal to become victims of a nuclear attack and their resolution to work for world peace. The National Council of Japan Nuclear Free Local Authorities, comprising of these municipalities, celebrates its 30th anniversary this month. If any members of such municipalities plan to take any action in accordance with the declaration they have made, they shall have the support of the National Council, as well as that of Nagasaki and Hiroshima.

In Nagasaki, the Fifth Nagasaki Global Citizens' Assembly for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons will be held this coming November. At this assembly, residents will play the key role in

disseminating the message for nuclear abolition to people around the world.

Meanwhile, the accident at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant operated by Tokyo Electric Power Company, Inc. has yet to be resolved and radioactive contamination continues to spread. In an instant, this accident deprived many residents in Fukushima of their peaceful daily lives. They are still forced to live without a clear vision as to their future. The residents of Nagasaki truly hope for the earliest possible recovery of Fukushima and will continue to support the people of Fukushima.

Last month, Mr. Senji Yamaguchi, a hibakusha who called for nuclear abolition and for better support for hibakusha, passed away. The number of hibakusha continues to decrease with their average age now exceeding seventy-eight. Once again, I call for the Japanese government to provide better support for these aging hibakusha.

We offer our sincere condolences for the lives lost in the atomic bombings, and pledge to continue our efforts towards realizing a nuclear-free world, hand-in-hand with the citizens of Hiroshima.

Tomihisa Taue

Mayor of Nagasaki

August 9, 2013

Civil society statement to the UN high-level meeting on nuclear disarmament

Civil society statement to the UN high-level meeting on nuclear disarmament 26 September 2013, New York
Delivered by Joseph Gerson of the American Friends Service Committee on behalf of civil society

I want to begin by invoking the words of Yamaguchi Senji, one of the most seared and courageous Nagasaki A-bomb survivors, who passed away this summer. Speaking to the Second Special Session on Disarmament thirty-one years ago, he said:

*Look at my face and hands.
We should never allow
people in the world or
succeeding generations to
suffer deaths and agonies
from nuclear war as we, the
Hibakusha, have done.*

We appeal that now is the time for the UN to draw a comprehensive disarmament program with a specific timetable and with a ban on nuclear weapons as its top priority, and do its utmost to uproot the crisis of nuclear war. Thirty-one years have passed since Yamaguchi-sensei's heartfelt appeal, and humanity still faces the threat of nuclear annihilation. It has been nearly two decades since the NPT was extended on the basis that the nuclear powers would pursue the "systematic and progressive" reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons globally, yet our survival remains in the balance against the world's estimated 17,000

remaining nuclear weapons. U.S.-Russian discussions on a follow-on to New START have stalled. Other nuclear-armed states, including China, India, and Pakistan, have continued to build up their overall nuclear weapons capabilities. All nuclear-armed states are engaging in or have plans to modernize their nuclear weapons.

We have been more than disappointed by the extremely limited and halting steps taken by the nuclear-armed states to fulfill their nuclear disarmament obligations. We are deeply disturbed by the reality that every nuclear-armed state has prepared for or threatened nuclear attack during wars and international crises; by the first use nuclear attack doctrines of most nuclear-armed states; by the modernizations of nuclear weapons; and by the continuing dangers of nuclear weapons proliferation.

The consequences of nuclear explosions so chillingly described by Nosizwe Baqwa are fundamentally inhuman. They are utterly incompatible with the elementary considerations of humanity that lie at the foundation of international humanitarian law. The implication is inescapable: these weapons must be completely eliminated. As the International Court of Justice made clear, elimination is required by the universally

binding legal obligation to engage in good faith negotiation for complete nuclear disarmament. That obligation is rooted not only in the NPT, but in the long history of the United Nations.

Ladies and gentleman, there are no good nuclear weapons and no right hands for them, just as there are no good chemical or biological weapons. The nuclear deterrence policies, belied in large measure by first-use doctrines, are predicated on the willingness and capacity to inflict genocidal or omnicidal destruction. Nuclear weapons do not and cannot bring security. They bring the threat of death and destruction—including for those downwind from nuclear tests and those who do the work of constructing and dismantling the weapons. Nuclear weapons drive proliferation, thus increasing the likelihood of nuclear war. They divert vast and essential resources needed to address real human needs—including the Millennium Development Goals.

We are not dealing with abstractions. Humans and our systems are anything but infallible. Accidents happen. Systems fail. And miscalculations are endemic to the human condition. Today marks the 30th anniversary of the day that Col. Petrov, the duty officer at a nuclear early-warning system command center near Moscow, may have saved humanity by reporting a false alarm when his systems warned that the U.S. had launched a nuclear attack. This year saw the release of an official report advising that cyber attacks may need to be countered by nuclear attacks. Nuclear missile tests have been conducted in the days running up to this meeting, and one is even scheduled for this very day. Northeast Asia experienced yet another nuclear

weapons test as well as simulated nuclear attacks. Also in that region, the world was brought to the brink of war, potentially nuclear war, in an increasingly militarized territorial dispute.

Tensions between nuclear powers flared again in South Asia.

It is long past time to begin and to conclude comprehensive negotiations for the time-bound, verified, and irreversible abolition of nuclear weapons. There is no lack of ways and means. A model treaty has been put forward by Malaysia and Costa Rica. This summer in Geneva, the unprecedented UN Open-Ended Working Group held in-depth discussions, with ample civil society participation, of proposals to take forward multilateral negotiations on the achievement of a world free of nuclear weapons. And the UN Secretary-General has put forward a five-point proposal on nuclear disarmament.

This high-level meeting has provided an opportunity to governments to take these proposals to the next level. Action to implement them needs to begin now. The recent Russian-US agreement on Syria's chemical weapons stocks serves as a reminder of what urgent and committed diplomacy can achieve. Nuclear weapons abolition, which is essential for human survival, should be pursued with the same sense of urgency and dedication.

Here are some key steps:

1. In the immediate aftermath of the Cold War, Presidents Gorbachev and Bush achieved a massive and reciprocal removal of nuclear weapons from deployment without

the laborious and obstacle-filled process of treaty negotiation. That is a model to emulate. Such parallel reductions, reinforced by the dealerting of their nuclear arsenals, would greatly reduce the nuclear threat and stimulate the process of multilateral nuclear weapons abolition by all nuclear-armed states.

2. All modernization of nuclear forces and infrastructure should cease.
3. Comprehensive negotiations for the abolition of nuclear weapons should be commenced without delay. They need not and should not await steps like entry into force of the nuclear test bantreaty and negotiation of a fissile materials treaty.
4. The conference for a Weapons of Mass Destruction-Free Middle East should be convened, and the world's Nuclear Weapons Free Zone Treaties should be reinforced by commitments to fully respect them.
5. States free of nuclear weapons have a role and responsibility to demand and work for nuclear abolition. Norway's and Mexico's examples of organizing conferences on the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons provide one model. Another is divestment from companies that produce nuclear weapons and their components, a policy now in effect in Norway and New Zealand and introduced as legislation in Switzerland. No one should profit from the production of inhuman, genocidal, and potentially omnicidal weapons.
6. The NPT recognizes that progress in the reduction of military tensions, elimination of biological and chemical

weapons, and limitations of so-called "conventional" weapons complements nuclear weapons abolition. Looking forward, limitations on anti-missile systems, cyber warfare, and other high-tech capabilities will also facilitate the complete elimination of all nuclear arsenals and nuclear weapons capabilities.

Each of us, whether head of state, minister, ambassador, activist, or scholar, has agency. Each of us is responsible to our loved ones and to future generations to protect human lives and to preserve the human species. Each of us—to different extents—can impact our nations' policies. On behalf of the world's NGOs working for the abolition of nuclear weapons, I urge you to remember your humanity and take bold actions to eliminate the danger of nuclear war and annihilation. If there are to be No More Hiroshimas, No More Nagasakis, No More Hibakushas, there must be No More Nuclear Weapons!!

The tipping point? 125 states at UNGA First Committee demand bold action

Ambassador Dell Higginson of New Zealand would have been forgiven for taking a pause to catch her breath after reading out the long list of names of the 125 states in support of the Joint Statement on the Humanitarian Consequences of Nuclear Weapons on 21 October 2013. She was afforded that opportunity by the eruption of applause in the room as civil society expressed its approval for states having made it clear that the most urgent concerns about these weapons – their humanitarian effects – should be at the centre of any discussion about nuclear disarmament.

The success of the statement, and the traction that the humanitarian approach has achieved over the last few years, can be traced to the significant efforts of civil society campaigners around the world who have informed, advised and pressured governments to be proactive in their support of the humanitarian initiative. The growing unity of civil society working on weapons-related issues was reflected in the Humanitarian Disarmament Campaigns Forum on 19-20 October, which was hosted by ICAN partners Article 36 and IKV Pax Christi and featured participation from the International Campaign to Ban Landmines and the Cluster Munitions Coalition (ICBL-CMC), the Campaign to

Stop Killer Robots, Control Arms, Oxfam International, Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, among others. The meeting allowed organisations from across the disarmament spectrum to share strategies and skills and discuss increased cooperation, recognising shared principles and the advantages of solidarity.

Inspired by previous successful disarmament processes, and recognising the powerful norms which have been established by treaties prohibiting other weapons of mass destruction such as chemical and biological weapons, civil society is now coalescing around the need to ban nuclear weapons, and its efforts have yielded impressive results. At last year's session of the First Committee, 34 states signed on to the joint statement delivered by Switzerland on the humanitarian dimension of nuclear weapons. One year later there has been a 367% increase in state support for the humanitarian approach, with even a group of NATO member states recognising this growing concern in a separate statement, delivered by Australia. There are those who would seek to minimise the importance of the humanitarian initiative, claiming that it is little more than an acknowledgment by states that nuclear weapons are

dangerous, which we have already known for years. Others even call it “a distraction”. However, ask any keen observer around the world, or indeed anyone in the room at the United Nations who felt the buzz when the statement was delivered, and they would tell you that the new momentum in the nuclear disarmament debate represents much more than that.

Recognising the humanitarian approach is an acknowledgment of the fact that the manner in which nuclear disarmament has proceeded over the last 40+ years since the NPT was established is no longer acceptable. It is clear that the efforts of the nuclear-armed states in fulfilling the disarmament pillar of the treaty are inadequate, and further, their insistence that the so-called “step-by-step” approach (to be led exclusively by nuclear weapons possessors) is the only way to make progress towards a world free of nuclear weapons is inaccurate at best and disingenuous at worst.

Something new is happening and that is undeniable. Many parties are putting forward new ideas as to how we can really break the status quo. The Open-Ended Working Group which took place in 2013 has provided space for discussions of these different options among civil society, states and experts from academia and international relief organisations such as the Red Cross and UN agencies such as UNDP and OCHA.

As the humanitarian initiative has grown

in stature and resonance, so has the concept of a ban treaty as a plausible and achievable means of breaking through the mire of the stagnant status quo. The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) argues that a legal instrument prohibiting all aspects of nuclear weapons would not only correct the anomaly in international law that at present allows for the most destructive of all weapons of mass destruction to not have been expressly made illegal, but would also be a decisive next step towards the global elimination of nuclear weapons. As President Heinz Fischer laid out at the High-Level Meeting on Nuclear Disarmament in New York just a month ago, the path forward has been laid out: we have to “stigmatize, ban and eliminate” nuclear weapons.

Right around the corner is the meeting of states, civil society and academia that Mexico will host on 13-14 February 2014. This conference will be a critical next step in a process to acknowledge, understand and then respond to the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons. States are aware of the significance of this moment, and, propelled by civil society, they are starting to make the logical connection between the truth about nuclear weapons and what can and must be done now to bring about their complete elimination. Some will still cling to a wait-and-see approach and place their hopes on a breakthrough in the deadlocked

disarmament machinery. Others will have recognised that we cannot afford to wait and see any longer. The NPT is a critical and indispensable component of the machinery of nuclear disarmament, but it needs to be strengthened. A treaty banning nuclear weapons would do just that – it would increase the force and speed behind the imperative to disarm, effectively complementing the existing obligations in the treaty. The overwhelming majority of states denounce the utter lack of progress made in nuclear disarmament. They criticise the nuclear-armed state parties to the NPT for not fulfilling up their end of the “bargain” that allowed them to hold onto their nuclear weapons in exchange for a general agreement of non-proliferation.

The work that civil society has undertaken over the last year has dramatically altered the discourse around nuclear weapons and has created the momentum for a change. Now, at the First Committee, 125 non-nuclear weapon states have declared that we cannot forget what these weapons actually mean – unacceptable humanitarian consequences for which no state or international organisation could provide an adequate response – and the next step towards a world free of nuclear weapons must be a bold one. It is imperative that we continue and build upon these efforts to achieve the turning point in the path towards elimination – a treaty banning nuclear weapons.

Courtesy: International Campaign for Abolishing Nuclear Weapons

The case for a nuclear ban

International Campaign for Abolishing Nuclear Weapons

Nuclear weapons are the only weapons of mass destruction not yet prohibited by an international convention, even though they have the greatest destructive capacity of all weapons. A global ban on nuclear weapons is long overdue and can be achieved in the near future with enough public pressure and political

leadership. A ban would not only make it illegal for nations to use or possess nuclear weapons; it would also help pave the way to their complete elimination. Nations committed to reaching the goal of abolition should begin negotiating a ban now.

International law obliges all nations to pursue in good faith and conclude negotiations for nuclear disarmament. However, the nuclear-armed nations have so far failed to present a clear road map to a nuclear-weapon-free world. All are investing heavily in the

modernization of their nuclear forces, with the apparent intention of retaining them for many decades to come. Continued failure is not an option. So long as nuclear weapons exist, there is a real danger they will be used again. A ban is urgently needed.



How a ban treaty would work

Negotiations on a treaty banning nuclear weapons should be undertaken by committed nations even without the participation of those armed with nuclear weapons. The alternative is to continue allowing the nuclear-armed nations to control the process and perpetuate two-tier systems and treaty regimes that have no power to compel disarmament. A nuclear weapons ban would globalize what nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties have done regionally. It would allow nations in any part of the world to formalize their rejection of nuclear weapons and help create a clear international legal norm against the possession of nuclear weapons.

The prohibition of weapons typically

precedes and stimulates their elimination, not the other way around. For example, the prohibition of biological and chemical weapons has been an essential step in ongoing efforts towards their elimination. Like the biological and chemical weapons conventions, a nuclear weapons ban would allow nations with stockpiles of these weapons to join so long as they agree to eliminate them within a specified time frame. Once such nations have joined, agreements could be developed over time to ensure that stockpiles are destroyed in a verifiable and irreversible manner.

The ban treaty itself need not necessarily envisage every complex step towards elimination by all nations. Instead it would put in place the basic framework for reaching that goal. Underpinning the

growing call for a ban is a firm belief that changing the “rules” regarding nuclear weapons would have a significant impact beyond those states that may formally adopt such an instrument at the outset. The ban treaty, once in force, would powerfully challenge any notion that possessing nuclear weapons is legitimate for particular states.

Achieving a ban treaty

Since 2010 the catastrophic humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons has featured prominently in discussions among governments and civil society organizations on ways to advance nuclear disarmament. This emerging discourse on the harm that nuclear weapons cause to people, societies and the environment underscores the urgency of concerted action for the complete prohibition and elimination of such weapons. Their devastating effects on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and through testing, have been well documented, and provide a clear rationale for negotiating a ban.

Nuclear-free nations have long complained of the lack of progress being made towards nuclear disarmament. Many have expressed grave concern at the continuing build-up and modernization of nuclear forces. Though frustrated, they are not without influence. After all, they make up the overwhelming majority of states. Working effectively together, they could put in place a

powerful legal ban on nuclear weapons, which would not only stigmatize the weapons, but also build the pressure for disarmament. It is time to change the game.

The **International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN)** is a global campaign coalition working to mobilize people in all countries to inspire, persuade and pressure their governments to initiate and support negotiations for a treaty banning nuclear weapons. We call on states, international organizations, civil society organizations and other actors to:

- Acknowledge that any use of nuclear weapons would cause catastrophic humanitarian and environmental harm.
- Acknowledge that there is a universal humanitarian imperative to ban nuclear weapons, even for states that do not possess them.
- Acknowledge that the nuclear-armed states have an obligation to eliminate their nuclear weapons completely.
- Take immediate action to support a multilateral process of negotiations for a treaty banning nuclear weapons.

ICAN’s campaign brings together humanitarian, environmental, human rights, peace and development organizations in more than 80 countries to seize the historic opportunity that

exists to outlaw and eliminate nuclear weapons. Prominent individuals such as anti-apartheid leader Desmond Tutu, the Dalai Lama, Yoko Ono and Martin Sheen have lent their support to the campaign.

National positions at a glance

Nations supporting a ban (151)

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua & Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Cook Islands, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Holy See, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kiribati, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New

Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Kitts & Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent & Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, São Tomé & Príncipe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Switzerland, Syria, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad & Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Vietnam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Nations sitting on the fence (22)

Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Germany, Georgia, Greece, Japan, Macedonia, Micronesia, Moldova, Montenegro, Nauru, Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Uzbekistan

Nations opposed to a ban (22)

Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States

Which countries have nuclear weapons and how many?

Nine countries together possess more than 17,000 nuclear weapons. The United States and Russia maintain roughly 2,000 of their nuclear weapons on high-alert status – ready to be launched within minutes of a warning. Most are many times more powerful than the atomic bombs dropped on Japan in 1945. A single nuclear warhead, if detonated on a large city, could kill millions of people, with the effects persisting for decades.

The failure of the nuclear powers to disarm has heightened the risk that other countries will acquire nuclear weapons. The only guarantee against the spread and use of nuclear weapons is to eliminate them without delay. Although the leaders of some nuclear-armed nations have expressed their vision for a nuclear-weapon-free world, they have failed to develop any detailed plans to eliminate their arsenals and are modernizing them.

COUNTRY	NUCLEAR PROGRAMME	SIZE OF ARSENAL
United States	The first country to develop nuclear weapons and the only country to have used them in war. It spends more on its nuclear arsenal than all other countries combined.	7,700 warheads
Russia	The second country to develop nuclear weapons. It has the largest arsenal of any country and is investing heavily in the modernization of its warheads and delivery systems.	8,500 warheads
United Kingdom	It maintains a fleet of four nuclear-armed submarines in Scotland, each carrying 16 Trident missiles. It is considering whether to overhaul its nuclear forces or disarm.	225 warheads
France	Most of its nuclear warheads are deployed on submarines equipped with M45 and M51 missiles. One boat is on patrol at all times. Some warheads are also deliverable by aircraft.	300 warheads
China	It has a much smaller arsenal than the US and Russia. Its warheads are deliverable by air, land and sea. It does not appear to be increasing the size of its arsenal.	250 warheads
India	It developed nuclear weapons in breach of non-proliferation commitments. It is steadily increasing the size of its nuclear arsenal and enhancing its delivery capabilities.	90–110 warheads
Pakistan	It is making substantial improvements to its nuclear arsenal and associated infrastructure. It has increased the size of its nuclear arsenal considerably in recent years.	100–120 warheads
Israel	It has a policy of ambiguity in relation to its nuclear arsenal, neither confirming nor denying its existence. As a result, there is little public information or debate about it.	80 warheads
North Korea	It has a fledgling nuclear weapons programme. Its arsenal probably comprises fewer than 10 warheads. It is not clear whether it has the capability to deliver them.	<10 warheads
Total		17,300 warheads

The wider problem

Five European nations host US nuclear weapons on their soil as part of a NATO nuclear-sharing arrangement, and roughly two dozen other nations claim to rely on US nuclear weapons for their security. Furthermore, there are now some 40 nations with nuclear power or research reactors capable of being diverted for weapons production. The spread of nuclear know-how has increased the risk that more nations will develop the bomb.

Nations with nuclear weapons	United States, Russia, Britain, France, China, Israel, India, Pakistan, North Korea
Nations hosting nuclear weapons	Belgium, Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Turkey
Nations in nuclear alliances	Albania, Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech, Denmark, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Korea, Spain

Pokharan's 15 Years: Have the Nuclear Weapons Worsened the Security Atmosphere?

Sandeep Pandey

When India tested its nuclear weapons in 1998, we were told that we need not worry about our security as we had the most powerful weapon in our arsenal. Some right wing political leaders challenged Pakistan to declare a time and a place of war. Some said now India could even take on US, what to talk about Pakistan.

However, half the enthusiasm subsided with Pakistan testing its weapons even before the month got over. Theory of de-

terrence was floated. Since we had the nuclear weapons no enemy could attack us. We talked of building a minimum credible deterrence. But this minimum keeps going up because the enemy, in this case Pakistan, is building more and more.

First we were involved in a conventional arms race now we are also involved in a nuclear arms race with Pakistan.

However, the irony is that when Pakistan

intruded in Kargil we could not use our nuclear weapons. Neither did it prevent Pakistan from entering our territory, i.e., it didn't act as a deterrent as we were made to believe it would. In fact, famous Pakistani physicist Pervez Hoodbhoy says that Pakistan could intrude because it knew that India would not engage in a full fledged war because of danger of nuclear weapons being used it. Hence the Indian nuclear weapon had an opposite effect. Instead of subduing Pakistan it emboldened it to carry out an intrusion. And when Kargil war broke out we had to go around the world to shop for the same conventional weapons that are normally used in wars. This proved that the impression created by the government the nuclear weapons would provide us security was a false one.

The Kargil war established one more fact. That nuclear weapon is not a weapon of war. It is a weapon of total destruction. And in a war in which both sides possessed it, it was a weapon of mutual destruction. Such a war has fortunately not taken place so far on earth.

Now Pakistan has employed the strategy of killing our soldiers in ones and twos, like the recent beheading of two soldiers. Sarabjit's killing in jail is also a part of this strategy. It knows that again because of abovementioned logic we'll not be able to respond aggressively. It is taking advantage of the presence of nuclear weapons which it knows we would not like to use to avoid retaliation. In any war between India

and Pakistan, India knows that most likely Pakistan will be in a more desperate situation to use the nuclear weapon first as India has a stronger army and more conventional weapons. It'll cause unacceptable damage to India. In such a situation the most India would be able to do is to cause unacceptable damage to Pakistan. It is ironical but actually Indian by testing nuclear weapons has lost the conventional military superiority over Pakistan. The Nuclear weapons testing by both countries has acted as an equalizer and Pakistan is in a neck-to-neck race with Indian in terms of nuclear weapons, both possessing about a hundred each presently.

In an estimate by some arms-control scientists in 2001 it has been predicted that between 1.5 to 5 lakhs people will get killed in each of the ten major cities of India and Pakistan, namely Mumbai, Chennai, Kolkata, Bengaluru, Delhi, Faislabad, Lahore, Karachi, Rawalpindi and Islamabad if a Hiroshima type bomb were to be dropped. Many more would get injured. Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev had said that in a nuclear war 'the living would envy the dead.' In reality the casualties would be much higher as cities have become more densely populated with high rise building and probably the size of bombs are much larger than what was used in 1945 over Hiroshima.

So, Pakistan had gained a certain advantage because of the nuclear weapons. It can continue to provoke India by organiz-

ing terrorist attacks like it did in Mumbai, beheading of soldiers, killing prisoners like Sarabjit without inviting any major retaliation from India. Pakistan's nuclear weapons are acting as a shield for them. It knows fully well that India will never engage in an all out nuclear war with it.

And now China has also adopted the same tactics. It intruded into the Indian side and made us feel helpless. For the time being the crisis has been averted but

we should realize that because of the same logic as given above India now will never be able to engage in a full fledged war with China. China, incidently is much superior in terms of conventional as well as nuclear armaments than us.

It is time to reflect what have we achieved with our nuclear weapons. The security environment in South Asia has worsened. We are not safe from external or internal terrorist attacks.

Deeper into Nuclear Darkness?

P K Sundaram

While the stability and security that Pokharan was supposed to bestow on India is still eluding, the country is facing a the grave consequences of nuclear weaponisation: a steep rise in the military budget, ever expanding nuclear arsenal and an unsafe, uneconomic and anachronistic expansion of nuclear energy that India had to embrace as a bargain for international legitimacy for its nuclear weapons.

Close to the 15th anniversary of the 1998 Pokharan nuclear tests this year, India shamelessly abstained from the UN voting on Arms Trade Treaty, having become the largest importer of arms in the world. This historic arms trade regulation pact which received the

support of 154 out of 180 countries. While 3 countries – Iran, Syria and North Korea opposed this treaty, India abstained along with 23 others like Russia, China and Saudi Arabia etc.

India opposed the proposed treaty since the beginning. Pakistan, being a friendly neighbour when it comes to arms race, has been supportive of India's stance, but it surprised the world by supporting the treaty just at the last moment.

India's insatiable arms obsession

In March this year, India made it big into two global lists: it came 137th in a list of 186 countries in the global human development index, and it became the world's largest arms importer accounting

for 12% of the world's total arms trade. India's share in global arms trade has grown at a rate of 25% – in the period between 2003-2008, it purchased 9% of the total arms transferred in the global arms market.

The report titled Trends in International Arms Transfers published by the reputed Stockholm Institute of Peace Research (SIPRI) listed India as the world's biggest importer of arms between 2008 and 2012. The global trends of arms transfer reveal a lot. While all the 5 biggest important were Asian countries – India (12 per cent of global imports), China (6 per cent), Pakistan (5 per cent), South Korea (5 per cent), and Singapore (4 per cent), all the major exporters of arms were from the West: US, Russia, Germany and France. China replaced the UK as the 5th largest exporter of arms. Israel and the US are biggest beneficiaries of India's military shopping spree, signalling and resulting in major implications for its foreign policy.

Rising Weapons Expenditures After 15 Years of Going Nuclear

India's increasing arms imports defy the claims of the nuclear hawks since 1998 that induction of nuclear weapons would bring stability and security for the country. May 11th this year would mark 15 years of India's nuclear tests in Pokhran. India's defence expenditures – on both nuclear and non-nuclear weapon systems – have increased dramatically since then. India's defence budget has

gone up from Rs. 35,277 crore in 1998 to a whopping 2,03,671.1 crore in 2013. In 2012-2013, India spent 1.93 trillion, or \$40 billion, marking an increase of 17 per cent over the previous year. India has been recently spending much more on naval and air forces compared to the army, a trend indicative of its rising power projections and self-perception. It's defence expenses between 1992 and 2012 have shot up by 1005%. 41% of which goes into acquisition of new weapons. In 2012, while it's GDP grew by 6.7%, figures on defence expenditure growth varied between 13 to 19%.

Arms race – both nuclear and conventional – is going unbridled in South Asia. Both the countries have been upgrading their nuclear arsenals, qualitatively and quantitatively. While India goes on to define its 'minimal credible deterrence' maximally, Pakistan has diversified its nuclear arsenals by including tactical nukes in January this year. Add to this the frequent missiles tests, of ever increasing ranges and payloads. India's recent addition of nuclear submarine in its arsenal would only further fuel this ace. South Asia is also home to gigantic military exercises on both sides – recently Indian Air Force did its biggest-ever exercise called Operation Iron Fist in Pokhran with nuclear-capable missiles. Pakistan, at the start of this year, had conducted a huge military exercise called Saffron Bandits.

Glaring Poverty Amid Super Power Dreams

Compare the facts on military build-ups with the shame of poverty in both the countries. While more than 40% people go to sleep without food in Pakistan. more than 230 million Indians go hungry daily. 37% of Indian deaths are still caused by “poor country” diseases like TB and malaria. A recent Oxford study has suggested that Nepal is reducing poverty faster than India. India’s While our national budget is hijacked by the security establishment, India last year ranked worst place among the G-20 countries for being a women – in terms of female education, health and safety. In terms of gender equality, in fact India fared worse than Pakistan in the UNDP human development report published in march 2013.

Needless to say, this huge stockpile of arms will push India into further belligerence and uglier conflicts. While India-Pakistan border has found place in the Guinness book of world records to be the world’s largest militarized territorial dispute, Indian political elite has been using heavily-armed tactics to subdue the dissenting sections of society – from the adivasis in Chhatisgarh to the ethnic minorities in the north-east and people protesting against neoliberalism in various parts of the country.

Deeper into the Nuclear Darkness

Contrary to the claims, the Indian foreign

policy actually has become less independent after Pokharan and in order to achieve legitimacy from Western powers for its nuclear status, India has to enter into humiliating deals implying purchase of unsafe reactors without nuclear liability. The Indian government is losing the historic opportunity in the wake of Fukushima accident in Japan, to shun nuclear energy and go for sustainable pattern of energy and development, because it has to fulfill the reactor purchase promises that it made to France, Russia, the US and others during the 2008 NSG clearance.

It is time to call the bluff of the political leadership in India which has twisted and perverted the peaceful and Gandhian credentials of our country to pay lip service to peace while indulging in worst kind of adventurism and a criminal distortion of national priorities. A nuclear free South Asia will be safer and more stable, will provide more room for the two countries to focus on hunger and education, and the region will be less prone to be manipulated by the great powers’ nuclear games.

Indian People's Charter on Nuclear Energy

The Indian People's Charter on Nuclear Energy is a statement emerging from the shared experiences, struggles and visions of grassroots movements for a safe energy future. Such movements have existed right since the inception of India's nuclear programme and have scored significant victories in places like Kerala.

More recently, people from Koodankulam (Tamil Nadu), Jaitapur (Maharashtra), Mithi Virdi (Gujarat), Kovvada (Andhra Pradesh), Gorakhpur (Haryana), Chutka (Madhya Pradesh) and Haripur (West Bengal) have waged relentless struggles against these anti-people and unsafe nuclear projects being promoted by the Nuclear Power Corporation of India Ltd (NPCIL). Their massive peaceful protests have been met with callousness and brutal repression on the part of the government. Communities near the existing nuclear facilities in Tarapur, Rawatbhata, Kalpakkam, Kaiga, Kakrapar and Hyderabad have also been raising voices against radiation leaks and their harmful effects, which are often hushed up by the authorities. Existing and proposed new uranium mines in Jharkhand, Andhra Pradesh and Meghalaya have also met with massive protests. In the recent past, these voices of protest have received solidarity and support from the wider democratic sections of Indian society. Intellectuals, policy experts, scientists, social activists, writers, artists and people from all walks of life have come out and backed these movements.

Nuclear energy is today widely seen as posing a threat to the life, livelihoods and the environment, not least because it can have irreversible catastrophic consequences and radiation effects spanning across generations. Chernobyl, followed by the Fukushima nuclear accident in Japan has led to global rethinking on the pursuit of nuclear energy with many countries reversing and phasing out their nuclear energy programmes. Owing to its inherent safety problems, exorbitant costs and secretive nature, it has been invariably thrust on people against their will through pressure tactics and often violent repression of local communities.

Despite the hyperbole surrounding it and its enormous budgets, nuclear power accounts only for 3% of India's electrical capacity. Yet India is planning to expand it massively, one of the main motives being to fulfil the promise of paybacks made to the US for the Indo-US nuclear deal and to other countries for their support in getting an endorsement for that agreement from the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Nuclear Suppliers' Group for India. Such expansion will also strengthen the domestic and foreign industrial lobbies that see great opportunities to profit. It will greatly reinforce the power and privilege of the nuclear establishment and further promote India's highly centralised and energy-intensive growth path.

The claim that nuclear energy is

indispensable for the country's energy security is widely questioned. Nuclear energy expansion will detract from our real requirements of ecologically sustainable, decentralised and equitable model of energy supply and use.

All this means that the issue of whether or not the path of nuclear energy should be pursued (and if so, how and under what preconditions) must be put upfront on the public agenda.

We demand that:

- A moratorium should be imposed with immediate effect on all proposed nuclear reactor projects.
- Land acquisition for nuclear projects should immediately be put on hold.
- An open and democratic national debate on nuclear energy and alternatives to it be organised. The government must acknowledge that there are serious and legitimate concerns about the hazards of nuclear power
- The government must constitute a high-level citizens' commission to examine the appropriateness, desirability, safety, environmental soundness, costs and long-term problems posed by nuclear power generation. This commission must include independent experts, social scientists and civil society representatives.
- The government must set up a body of *independent* experts to carry out baseline health and environmental surveys in all areas where it is proposed to set up reactors, start mining and otherwise establish activities and structures connected to the whole

nuclear fuel cycle. The survey results must be transparently shared with the local public, which must assured full and unimpeded access to their health data.

- The existing process of Environmental Impact Assessment for nuclear projects by non-accredited bodies is unacceptable. So is the non-consideration of specific nuclear hazards, including radiation leaks, radioactive waste storage, transportation risks, accidents, etc. Environmental clearances to all nuclear projects must be tightened with mandatory public hearings and full disclosure of all pertinent facts, including those related to the generic problems of nuclear power generation – radiation, effluents and emissions, requirements and availability of resources such as freshwater, impact on forests, fauna and flora and local ecosystems, potential for accidents and mishaps, waste separation, storage and disposal, hazards from transportation of nuclear materials, and risks to public and planned measures to mitigate these. The definition of potentially affected population by nuclear mishaps must be severely revised in the light of the catastrophic accidents like Chernobyl and Fukushima.
- Veto power must be entrusted to the local population as to whether they wish or not wish to have a nuclear installation or uranium mining or other related dangerous facilities to come up in their areas. Instead of the farce that currently takes place, there must be proper *Jan Sunwais* that are well advertised, organised by independent civil society bodies and open to participation and testimonies from all, be they ordinary civilians, concerned groups or experts.
- A transparent safety review of the

entire nuclear sector be carried out by independent experts. Periodic safety reviews of existing nuclear facilities and mining sites must be carried out by independent experts.

- The authorities should facilitate long-term and medium-term health studies near these facilities by independent health experts and their findings must be publicised by the government. A citizens-based network for radiation monitoring near nuclear facilities should be created and financed out of a public fund expressly created for that purpose.
- Independent health inspection of nuclear workers should be carried out periodically and the results be made public. No contract worker should be employed in the nuclear sector because their health condition cannot be properly monitored.
- The government must immediately bring forth new legislation to replace the 1962 Atomic Energy Act to maximise the transparency of functioning and public accountability of the nuclear programme, with full public participation in decision-making.
- The Atomic Energy Regulatory Board has failed to perform its mandate and violates its own norms. It must be immediately made completely independent of the DAE and staffed by senior personnel known for their public probity and independence of mind who can be trusted to be completely impartial in their supervision. Furthermore, its budget provisions should come through the Ministry of Environment and Forests.
- The Right to Information Act must be made fully applicable to all aspects pertaining to the existence and

development of the civilian nuclear energy sector so that the government cannot claim secrecy in the name of security considerations and thereby hide relevant information.

- Emergency plans for disaster management which include procedures for mass evacuation must be publicly discussed and examined and approved by the representative bodies of those likely to be affected. The government must establish with full local participation the practical mechanisms, structures and practices for rapid and effective evacuation along with initial— and periodic — trials runs to ensure the reliability of such evacuation procedures in case of accidents.
- The present Nuclear (Civil Liability) Act 2010 is not based on the moral and legal principle of absolute liability in case of accidents and must be suitably amended. Moreover, any attempts to further dilute the Act by formulating Rules calculated to artificially restrict and limit the suppliers' liability must be dropped.
- The government must immediately provide health facilities and adequate compensation to all victims of radiation sickness living around India's nuclear installations. The government presently does not even acknowledge these health effects.

The government must immediately and unconditionally withdraw all charges of sedition and other false allegations against people protesting against nuclear projects. In the specific case of Koodankulam, the Supreme Court has directed the withdrawal of all charges against protesters which the Tamil Nadu government has refused to do.

Given these infirmities of nuclear energy,

it is imperative to prepare a comprehensive alternative energy policy based on principles of equity, environmental sustainability and affordability, and on conventional and non-conventional energy resources, including solar, wind, small hydro, etc. This is the least that the government owes to the Indian public. The nuclear energy fuel cycle is too important a matter to be left only in the hands of scientists, bureaucrats, industrialists and politicians.

Organisations:

- Coalition for Nuclear Disarmament and Peace(CNDP)
- National Alliance of Anti-Nuclear Movements
- People's Movement Against Nuclear Energy(PMANE)
- Konkan Vinashkari Prkalp Virodhi Samiti
- Lokayat, Pune
- Samajwadi Jan Parishad
- Bharat Jan Vigyan Jatha
- Indian Doctors for Peace and Development (IDPD)
- Greenpeace India
- Gorakhpur Parmanu Virodhi Samiti

And hundreds of individual activists.

A Child Hibakusha -- Hiroshima 1947

by Yuko Taniguchi

My mother

When my hair began falling out, my mother got down on her knees and picked up one hair at a time. My hair was everywhere--under the hospital bed, inside my sleeves, on the white wall.

My mother would sweep the floor, press my hair into a black ball between her hands and put it inside her apron's pocket. Even after I became bald, the hairs continued to well up like spring water in the mountain. When the wind came through the window, my hairs moved like worms on the wet ground. This morning, my hair was inside my mother's noodle soup. She filled her mouth with my hair and noodles and swallowed them all at once.

My brother

My brother pushed my swing, and I went up high. When I came down and passed him, he said he could see the top of my head, bare, full, and smooth like the belly of a pregnant woman.

My grandmother

Thousands of pieces of glass flew into my grandmother's head like bees into a hive.

After she lost all of her hair, she died. Inside the coffin, my grandmother's head shone as if the stars were buried underneath her skin.

My River

River, I'm going to die soon. My grandmother, Cousin Toshi and Mrs. Kamata in the next village all died when they lost their hair.

You keep moving onto the next village, to the ocean and to the rivers in another country. It would take you one hundred years to come back to Hiroshima again.

The Coalition for Nuclear Disarmament and Peace (CNDP) is India's national network of over 200 organisations, including grassroots groups, mass movements and advocacy organisations, as well as individuals. Formed in November 2000, CNDP demands that India and Pakistan roll back their nuclear weapons programmes. Our emphasis:



- No to further nuclear testing
- No to induction and deployment of nuclear weapons
- Yes to global and regional nuclear disarmament



CNDP's website

www.cndpindia.org is a good resource page on nuclear developments in India, South Asia and the world. Please visit the site and join the CNDP events and initiatives.