



**Number 09**  
**December 2010**

A Monthly Newsletter for Strengthening Awareness of Nuclear Abolition.

This page includes independent news coverage which is part of a project supported by Soka Gakkai International

This newsletter brings you independent news by IPS correspondents, in-depth reports and analyses by partners as well as columns by experts, news from international NGOs and a review of the global media for a glimpse of what is happening on the ground. Join us in helping strengthen awareness about the abolition of nuclear weapons – and encourage your friends and colleagues to subscribe to this free monthly newsletter.

Newspaper articles reproduced in this newsletter are for personal use and aim at giving information to readers. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission is prohibited.

## Opinions

### **Eliminating Nuclear Weapons: Education is Central**

Viewpoint by Kathleen Sullivan

[http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=316:nukes-education&catid=16:nuclear-abolition-news-and-analysis&Itemid=17](http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=316:nukes-education&catid=16:nuclear-abolition-news-and-analysis&Itemid=17)

### **Two Cheers for New START**

Viewpoint by Jayantha Dhanapala

<http://www.indepthnews.net/news/news.php?key1=2010-12-24%2018:38:43&key2=1>

## Articles

### **Obama Scores Win with New START Ratification**

WASHINGTON DC - U.S. President Barack Obama scored key wins Wednesday in both foreign policy and domestic politics as more than the required two-thirds of the Senate - including 13 Republicans who defied their party's leadership - voted to ratify the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START) with Russia. <http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=53944>

### **Debunking the Nuclear Deterrence Myth**

UNITED NATIONS - When the horrors of the Cold War began to wane in the late 1980s, U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Russian President Mikhail Gorbachev met in the Icelandic capital Reykjavik to discuss the "complete abolition of nuclear weapons". Over two decades later, global political leaders continue to assemble enormous nuclear arsenals.

<http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=53826>

### **Obama Pushes START Treaty to Top of Legislative Agenda**

WASHINGTON - With time running out before he faces a much more hostile and Republican Congress, President Barack Obama appears to have made Senate ratification of the pending New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) with Russia his top legislative priority. <http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=53758>

### **Nuclear Disarmament Has a Future**

The United Nations is keen to counter growing skepticism about nuclear disarmament really happening and culminating into a nuke free world. According to the UN High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Sergio Duarte, the peoples and countries of the world are not willing to hang on to nuclear weapons and put at risk all that has been accomplished in building international interdependence.

<http://www.indepthnews.net/news/news.php?key1=2010-12-15%2004:07:16&key2=1>

### **Visit Compilation of Articles April 2009-March 2010**

[http://www.nuclearabolition.net/documents/Beyond\\_Nuclear\\_Non-Proliferation.pdf](http://www.nuclearabolition.net/documents/Beyond_Nuclear_Non-Proliferation.pdf)

## Translations | Adaptations

## Civil Society's Perspective

## What Others Say



## Opinion

### Eliminating Nuclear Weapons: Education is Central

Viewpoint by Kathleen Sullivan\*



NEW YORK - Upon hearing the stories of atomic bomb survivors, a high school student in Manhattan remarked, "It made me realise how fast and instantly the world as we know it could turn literally into nothing but dust and ashes." Today the proliferation of nuclear weapons continues in a climate of decreased concern.

We no longer have the massive global disarmament movements of the 1960s and 1980s; instead nuclear issues are a kind of background noise. Nuclear news items appear almost daily and are reported in a fairly straight-forward manner. However, they also contain deeper meanings that evade the awareness of many, particularly young people who are growing up with scant knowledge of the distinctive risks of the nuclear age.

To achieve a nuclear weapon-free world we need an educated citizenry that fully appreciates the radioactive violence and Damoclean danger constituted by nuclear bombs. As acknowledged in the United Nations Study on Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Education, UN member states need to regard the education of future leaders and citizens with urgency and dedication. Educators should seek creative means to engage young people in nuclear issues, and this requires a thoughtful approach -not only education about disarmament but education for disarmament.

Former Secretary-General Kofi Annan defined this as an absolute necessity: "There has never been a greater need for education in the areas of disarmament and non-proliferation, especially with regard to weapons of mass destruction, but also in the field of small arms and international terrorism. Since the end of the Cold War, changing concepts of security and threat have demanded new thinking. Such new thinking will arise from those who are educated and trained today." (<http://disarmament.un.org:8080/education/study.html>).

Still, few students understand the basic facts and are often surprised to learn that approximately 23,000 nuclear weapons are owned by nine nations and remain a threat to all life on earth. Many people are unaware that nuclear weapons are unique and are not at all like conventional bombs. We are rarely reminded that the primary effects of a nuclear explosion include a blast, heat, fire, and radiation, producing destruction on an unimaginable scale.

The immense light and heat of a nuclear explosion is three times greater than at the interior of our sun and can initiate firestorms, which deplete oxygen from the environment and create hurricane-force winds that in turn attract debris and feed the storm, causing super-infernos. According to Lynne Eden of Stanford University, a 300 kiloton bomb, the average size of most strategic nuclear weapons (dwarfing the one dropped on Hiroshima, which was around 15 kilotonnes), would create firestorms over a 40-65 mile radius where "virtually no one...would survive". (<http://bos.sagepub.com/content/60/1/32.full>)

Educators also need to encourage awareness of another, much-misunderstood effect of nuclear weaponry -long-lived radiation. Once released, radioactive elements can hang around for millennia, putting future generations at risk of developing cancer and genetic mutations. Long after a nuclear weapon is detonated, radiation does its deadly work in secret. Plutonium, one of the main radioactive ingredients of nuclear weapons, has a half-life of 24,000 years.

Many students are unaware that there are still people alive today who survived the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. In Japanese, atomic bomb survivors are called hibakusha. Listening to their stories can help provide young people with a confident understanding of nuclear issues. In hearing their first hand testimony, students can begin to understand the exceptional dangers of nuclear weapons and radiation and thus grasp the daily realities of our nuclear age. ☺

---

\* Kathleen Sullivan is the Programme Director for Hibakusha Stories, an arts-based initiative that brings atomic bomb survivors into New York City High Schools to share their testimonies. She has produced two films about survivors from Nagasaki: *The Last Atomic Bomb* (2005) and *The Ultimate Wish* (forthcoming).



# BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

People's Decade for Nuclear Abolition  
Act to make the world safe for people



## Opinion

➔ This urgent education and understanding is needed not only for young people but, sadly, for some adults as well, many in positions of political power, who believe that nuclear weapons are a fact of life and we will just have to learn how to live with the threat.

Even though there has been some talk of the importance of disarmament (in some unidentified future) and there are international laws and agreements to usher in the end of the nuclear weapon era, there is still a yawning gap between rhetoric and reality.

Which countries have Nuclear Disarmament Agencies? Which nations are prepared to plan for the dismantling of their arsenals? What monies and personnel are allocated for this most noble of tasks?

And given the choice, do we really want to live in a world where we have the power to switch off the lights on all complex life forms?

Not great social calculus is needed to understand that the farther we get from the realities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki the closer we are to the use of nuclear weapons again, by accident or by design. In recent major media, we have heard a re-mix of the duck and cover mentality that sheltering in place can save lives. The only way to avoid the dangers of a nuclear attack is to educate ourselves about the true meaning of nuclear weapons, and get rid of them. (DECEMBER 2010/COPYRIGHT IPS) ■

---

## Two Cheers for New START

Viewpoint by Jayantha Dhanapala\*

WASHINGTON DC - A modest bilateral nuclear disarmament treaty, concluded at an accelerated pace in the first 15 months of the Obama Administration with the Russian Federation, has now survived what departing Senator Arlen Specter calls the political "cannibalism" of his Republican Party, to be ratified in the U.S. Senate by 71 votes to 26.



It climaxes a spurt of Congressional action in a lame duck session which saw Obama achieve the extension of the Bush II tax cuts, albeit with the rich benefiting too, and repealing the "Don't ask; Don't tell" Clinton policy regarding gays in the U.S. Military, inter alia.

Before we rush to acclaim this treaty ratification as an Obama victory for policy persistence or a tribute to bipartisanship, some perspective is necessary so that we realize that this is not an unqualified success for nuclear disarmament -- without which there can be no nuclear non-proliferation.

The renegade Cold Warriors -- Schultz, Kissinger, Nunn and Perry -- with their 2007 and 2008 Wall Street Journal op-eds call for nuclear weapon abolition and an end to the faith-based nuclear deterrence fiction, influenced the U.S. Presidential campaign of 2008 and reignited the civil society movement for Global Zero.

Obama's community organizer experience had taught him to temper idealism with pragmatism in seeking a consensus. And so, the soaring rhetoric of a nuclear weapon free world vision was grounded in the caveats he wrote into his Prague speech of April 2009 ("perhaps not in my lifetime" etc).

To those who only saw the vision, the New START with Russia, the Washington Nuclear Security Summit, the Nuclear Posture Review and the success of the 2010 NPT Review Conference were milestones on an irreversible road to zero nukes.

Those sceptics who saw through it all as "nuclearism", or make-believe nuclear disarmament, were not surprised when at the first salvo of pro-nuclear establishment protests, promoted of course by special-interest groups, Obama wilted. ➔

---

\*Jayantha Dhanapala is a former UN Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs and a former Ambassador of Sri Lanka.



# BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

People's Decade for Nuclear Abolition  
Act to make it a reality



## Opinion

➡ First, he ensured that the weapons laboratories, which are central in the nuclear weapons establishment, are funded beyond their wildest dreams (\$85 billion over ten years); then denied he was doing anything but uphold the scientifically unproven and politically provocative missile defence system of past Republican administrations; and granted other Republican requests despite their negative impact on the deficit.

In Europe, the NATO Strategic Concept Review ended predictably with a "business as usual" document despite European allies wanting U.S. nuclear weapons removed from their soil.

When New START was signed on April 8, 2010, it was rightly hailed as a return to traditional nuclear arms control via verifiable and irreversible treaty arrangements between the two nuclear giants who owned an estimated 95% of the nuclear weapons in the world. This was also part of the overdue "resetting" of U.S.-Russian relations, which had been allowed to slide under both Clinton and Bush II, and almost resulted in a clash over Georgia.

An estimated 30% reduction of permitted deployed strategic nuclear weapons over a seven-year period is envisaged out of the total of 22,400 nuclear warheads in the arsenals of nine nuclear weapon-armed countries, 7500 of them on operational status.

Apart from visceral U.S. Republican allergy to arms reductions, specific attention was focused by opponents of New START on its verifiability -- a rich irony when the 2002 Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty (SORT) had no verification and the 1991 START I arrangements were allowed to lapse in December 2009 -- and on the innocuous preambular language on missile defence leading to wild accusations of secret agreements to abandon what is in fact a wasteful and ineffective military programme with illusory defence.

Surprisingly, the Obama Administration was in a defensive mode both before and after the mid-term Congressional elections with its swing towards the GOP. A readiness to compromise on fundamental principles disappointing the hopes raised by the Prague speech morphed from flexibility to ensure the right numbers to downright horse-trading as some Republican Senators upped the ante at the behest of lobbyists.

Just as Obama's liberal supporters were disappointed over what finally came out as health reform, similar disappointment is now being voiced over the concessions made to secure the ratification.

First came the promise to maintain a credible nuclear deterrent under the euphemism of "modernization" which escalated into typical pork-barrel politicking to satisfy the insatiable appetite of Senators like Kyl of Arizona who eventually reneged on his promises. Then came the groveling assurances on missile defence painting the Obama Administration into a corner that Clinton cleverly stayed away from. Supporters of the Prompt Global Strike weapon system also joined the fray and soon the disarmament community began to portray New START as "an arms affirmation treaty" rather than the beginning of a process towards a nuclear weapon-free world.

The process leading to the U.S. Senate ratification has, once again, proved that U.S. politics is driven by special interests groups leaving the interests of the people in the lurch. Well before Wikileaks websites monitoring how money lubricates the system, disclosed legally available data.

For example, one report said that military contractors, with stakes in missile defence, spent an estimated \$59 million lobbying the Senate since New START was signed. Another report revealed that between April 8 and September 22, 2010, Raytheon spent \$22,750,000 on lobbying; Lockheed Martin \$13,905,000; Boeing \$9,430,000; and Northrop Grumman \$9,080,000. Amidst this sordid spectacle was the shining example of Senator Lugar and his other Republican colleagues whose principled vote for ratification was never in doubt.

The U.S. Senate ratification of New START has thus exposed the strength of the opposition by the cold warriors and the military-industrial complex to nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. They exist and work assiduously in many countries and represent, collectively, what President Eisenhower, in the wisdom distilled from an illustrious military career followed by 8 years as President of the USA during the Cold War, warned us about in his farewell speech in January 1961: ➡



# BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

People's Decade for Nuclear Abolition  
Act to make "Yes we can" a reality



## Opinion

☞ "In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.

"We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together."

Doing the right thing for the wrong reasons is an old practice in politics as T.S.Eliot said in 'Murder in the Cathedral':

"The last temptation is the greatest treason;  
To do the right deed for the wrong reason."

Many believed Obama when he declared -- "clearly and with conviction America's commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons." adding "(we) must ignore the voices who tell us that the world cannot change. We have to insist, 'Yes, we can.'"

He can still redeem himself by continuing to seek the elimination of nuclear weapons despite the odds he faces.  
(IDN-InDepthNews/24.12.2010) ■

---

## Articles

### **Obama Scores Win with New START Ratification**

**By Jim Lobe\***

WASHINGTON, Dec 22, 2010 (IPS) - U.S. President Barack Obama scored key wins Wednesday in both foreign policy and domestic politics as more than the required two-thirds of the Senate - including 13 Republicans who defied their party's leadership - voted to ratify the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START) with Russia.

Obama hailed the bipartisan outcome during a short-notice press conference in which he claimed that it "sends a powerful signal to the world that Republicans and Democrats stand together on behalf of our security".

"This is the most significant arms control agreement in nearly two decades, and it will make us safer and reduce our nuclear arsenals along with Russia," he declared.

On the foreign policy front, ratification not only preserves Obama's vision of strengthening the global nuclear non- proliferation regime and promoting a gradual global denuclearisation remain alive.

More immediately, it also gives renewed momentum to his much-heralded "re-set" of relations with Russia. Moscow's cooperation on Obama's two most pressing overseas priorities - curbing Iran's nuclear programme and prosecuting Washington's counter-insurgency campaign in Afghanistan - is seen here as critical to prospects for their success. In a sign of approval, officials in Moscow said Wednesday that the Russian Duma is likely to vote for ratification later this week.

On the political front, the fact that so many Republicans voted with the administration confirms the existence of serious internal differences - at least on national security issues - that can be effectively exploited by Obama, even as it faces a new, more Republican Congress next month.

Moreover, Wednesday's vote comes on top of several other perceived legislative victories by Obama since last month's disastrous mid-term election. Notably, these include the passage of an \$850-billion package of tax cuts and stimulus measures and the repeal - strenuously opposed by right-wing Republicans - of the "Don't Ask Don't Tell" (DADT) policy that banned openly gay men and lesbians from serving in the U.S. military. ☞





# BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

People's Decade for Nuclear Abolition  
Act to make "Freeze" a reality



## Articles

➡ "The result is that the president is closing out the year looking a lot more formidable as a political player than he did just a week ago, let alone after the mid-terms," said one Capitol Hill staffer, referring to the self-described "shellacking" Obama suffered in the November elections.

Wednesday's ratification of New START capped an intense three-week lobbying campaign conducted by the White House and backed by the Pentagon, the chiefs of the armed services, and former top national security officials ranging across five Republican administrations, including former President George H. W. Bush himself, and former secretaries of state Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, James Baker, Colin Powell, and Condoleezza Rice.

Signed last April, the substantive provisions of the treaty are considered relatively modest. It requires both Washington and Moscow to reduce the number of strategic nuclear warheads from around 2,200 to no more than 1,550 within seven years.

It will also permit the resumption of mutual inspections by both parties. They were halted last year when the previous START treaty, signed by Bush senior in 1991, expired.

Despite the treaty's modest provisions, right-wing Republicans, led by Minority Whip John Kyl, opposed ratification, arguing that some of the treaty's language might be used to curb the development of U.S. missile-defence systems and that the thousands of tactical nuclear weapons held by Russia were not covered under its terms. They also insisted that the treaty's verification provisions were inadequate.

But their strongest objection was political: that Obama should not try to force through an arms-control treaty during a lame-duck session of Congress, particularly when the Democratic majority will be substantially reduced in the incoming Congress.

"I can't understand why we can't wait five more weeks to ratify," complained Sen. Lindsey Graham Tuesday when the chamber voted 67-28 to end five days of debate on the treaty.

Treaty supporters knew that, with six additional Republicans in the incoming Senate, the administration would have found it much more difficult and politically costly to gain ratification.

As it was, the administration conceded on a number of issues during negotiations with Kyl before the November elections. Among other things, it agreed to commit nearly \$85 billion for a proposed five-year nuclear-arms modernisation programme.

The administration was stunned when, after the elections, Kyl, backed by Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, suggested that the vote on ratification be delayed until next year.

At that point, the White House's lobbying efforts shifted into high gear, while peace, disarmament, and church-based groups mobilised their supporters to press "swing" senators at the local level.

Although at the time only one Republican senator - Richard Lugar, the ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee - had come out in strong public support of the treaty, at least half a dozen others had hinted they were inclined to vote yes under the right circumstances.

In the following weeks, the White House lined up all living former secretaries of state, most secretaries of defence, and all living former presidents except George W. Bush. It also elicited strongly supportive statements by key NATO allies and by several key Jewish groups worried that the treaty's defeat would result in the end of Moscow's cooperation with Washington on Iran.

Ranged against them were the far-right Heritage Foundation, former U.N. ambassador John Bolton of the American Enterprise Institute, a number of prominent neo-conservatives, such as the Weekly Standard's William Kristol, and several likely 2012 presidential candidates, including, most notably, Sarah Palin and Mitt Romney. ➡



## Articles

➔ Despite polling showing overwhelming public support for ratification, McConnell and Kyl sided with the latter group in what now appears to have been a major political miscalculation, one that became much clearer when the number-three Republican, Lamar Alexander, broke ranks Tuesday.

"Republicans have only themselves to blame here," wrote Adam Serwer on the American Prospect website. "Because Senate Republicans turned ratification into a huge partisan brawl, a Democratic president renewing an agreement with Russia designed by Republican presidents now looks like a massive victory for the administration."

"In the end, over one-quarter of the Republican Caucus took the advice of the Joint Chiefs and nearly every living former secretary of defence and state over the recommendations of Jon Kyl and John Bolton," said Joe Cirincione, president of the Ploughshares Fund, one of the treaty's major non-governmental backers.

"Their extreme views advocating more weapons and more wars have been rejected by those who know them best," he went on. "This is a very hopeful sign for future debates on nuclear policy, on military action and on military budgets."

Despite that assessment, however, most observers believe that Senate ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) – Obama's top legislative priority on his disarmament agenda after New START – will not be possible with the incoming Senate, where right-wing Republicans will be stronger than ever.

As a result, the administration is considered likely to pursue more modest measures, such as an accord with Russia to reduce tactical nuclear weapons, designed to persuade the international community that Washington is committed to denuclearisation as a long-term goal.

Meanwhile, Wednesday's vote is likely to further warm ties with Moscow where Russian officials this week publicly warned against the treaty's defeat or delay.

"Perhaps as significant as the treaty's impact on the two countries' nuclear arsenals is its contribution to the ongoing improvement in U.S.-Russia relations," said Dylan Myles-Primakoff, a Russia expert at Georgetown University's Emerging Threats Project.

"If this hadn't passed, it could have jeopardised Washington's use of Russian territory and airspace to transport troops and supplies to Afghanistan and Moscow's willingness to refrain from vetoing any new U.N. Security Council sanctions against Iran," he added. ■

---

## Debunking the Nuclear Deterrence Myth

By Kanya D'Almeida

UNITED NATIONS, Dec 9, 2010 (IPS) - When the horrors of the Cold War began to wane in the late 1980s, U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Russian President Mikhail Gorbachev met in the Icelandic capital Reykjavik to discuss the "complete abolition of nuclear weapons".

Over two decades later, global political leaders continue to assemble enormous nuclear arsenals.

According to 2010 statistics taken from the United Nations NGO Committee on Disarmament, Peace and Security, nine states currently own - or possess the means to develop and deploy - nuclear weapons. Of these countries, the combined arsenals of the U.S. and Russia account for 95 percent of the weapons.

For years, particularly in the public discourse of U.S. foreign policy, the disarmament debate has been dominated by the Deterrence Theory, which suggests that potential aggressors to a state are deterred by the mere threat of nuclear warfare.

At a panel discussion this week hosted by the NGO Committee on Disarmament, legal experts John Burroughs and Ward Wilson sought to expose the fallacy of this theory and redirect the dialogue on disarmament into more constructive channels. ➔



# BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

People's Decade for Nuclear Abolition  
Act to make "No more nuclear weapons"



## Articles

➔ Wilson, a senior fellow at the Centre for Non-Proliferation Studies (CNS), stressed that the international community needs to undergo a "paradigm shift, a radical change in our approach to disarmament, akin to Copernicus's revolution in understanding the very world we live in."

For years many countries, particularly the U.S., have considered the deterrence theory to be "dangerous, possibly immoral, but certainly necessary", he said. Yet, according to Wilson's research, the annals of history are filled with evidence that neither the use nor the threat of nuclear weapons have deterred war, induced surrender, or guaranteed victory to any side. Perhaps the most widely cited example of the potency of nuclear weapons has been Japan's surrender, following President Truman's order to drop Little Boy on Hiroshima on Aug. 6, 1945.

For years, the U.S. has touted this tragedy as a nuclear success story, using it as a trope with which to prop up, and justify, subsequent nuclear development, Wilson said. He debunked this idea by calling attention to several obscured facts that never made it into the mainstream, such as the fact that Hiroshima was only one of 68 Japanese cities that had already been mercilessly fire-bombed for months on end.

The number of deaths in Hiroshima caused by the bombing bring its rank to just ninth or tenth on the scale of atrocities in Japan at the time - why, then, did the Japanese only surrender after Little Boy?

The answer, according to Wilson, is a simple matter of myth-making. Many historians, legal experts, and scholars now believe that in reality, Japan only surrendered following the Soviet invasion, prior to the explosion of Fat Man in Nagasaki on Aug. 9.

There are countless legal implications to the debunking of this myth, not least of which are clear violations of international humanitarian law.

John Burroughs, executive director of the Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy (LCNP), recently co-authored a statement entitled "Ending U.S. Reliance on Nuclear Weapons and Achieving their Global Elimination: Wise Policy and Required by Law", which lays out in detail the illegality of possessing nuclear weapons, for deterrence or otherwise.

"In this environment," write the authors, "the substantial U.S. nuclear arsenal numbering thousands of weapons does not serve U.S. security interests. Nuclear weapons have themselves become the main security threat the United States faces."

The article goes on to contextualise the law of war and of armed conflict as agreed upon in the Hague and Geneva Conventions, as well as in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and the 1996 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice.

According to Burroughs, the "fact that the use of nuclear weapons would be unlawful under the law of armed conflict necessarily means that any specific U.S. threat to use those weapons would be unlawful, and strongly suggests that the policy of deterrence is also unlawful. Why would a country possess nuclear weapons if there was not readiness to use them in certain circumstances?"

"We are now faced with a sad reliance on the threat of annihilation as a permanent condition. This isn't the kind of world that we should want to live in," Burroughs told IPS. Meanwhile, the U.S. continues, unabashed, to strengthen its formidable nuclear arsenal while simultaneously turning the spotlight of international condemnation onto countries like Iran, North Korea and Syria.

"There is no current obvious way in the international arena to go beyond the court's 1996 advisory opinion to challenge states' reliance on nuclear weapons as 'threats', notably given that the Security Council is run by the nuclear-armed Permanent Five," Burroughs told IPS.

"However, Mexico is now proposing that the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court be amended to specifically criminalise the use or threatened use of nuclear weapons," he added.

"It is conceivable that in the near term states parties would adopt this amendment. Adding nuclear weapons to the list of prohibited weapons already in the Rome Statute (poisons and poisonous gases, expanding bullets) would help entrench the norm of non-use of nuclear weapons," he said. ■





## Articles

### **Obama Pushes START Treaty to Top of Legislative Agenda**

**By Jim Lobe\***

WASHINGTON, Dec 2, 2010 (IPS) - With time running out before he faces a much more hostile and Republican Congress, President Barack Obama appears to have made Senate ratification of the pending New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) with Russia his top legislative priority.

Not only has he bowed to Republican demands to allocate more money for Washington's nuclear arms programme, but he has suggested that he's also willing to cave in to Republican demands to extend tax cuts for high-income households - despite record federal deficits - in order to gain START ratification.

And he's getting considerable help from big guns in what remains of the Republican foreign policy Establishment, including five former secretaries of state whose service spanned the last five Republican administrations.

In an op-ed heralded by the White House on the eve of its publication in Thursday's Washington Post, former secretaries Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, James Baker, Lawrence Eagleburger and Colin Powell concluded that the New START was "clearly in our national interest" and should be ratified.

The five men who, respectively, served under Presidents Nixon and Ford, Reagan, George H.W. Bush, and George W. Bush, argued that their former bosses "recognised that reducing the number of nuclear arms in an open, verifiable manner would reduce the risk of nuclear catastrophe and increase the stability of America's relationship with the Soviet Union and, later, the Russian Federation."

Nonetheless, the treaty's fate remains uncertain. Hard-line neo-conservatives and far-right Republicans, whose ranks will be swollen in the Congress that will be sworn into office one month from now, remain adamantly opposed to START, which requires, among other things, a reduction in the nuclear arsenals of both countries of deployed, long-range missiles from 2,200 to 1,550.

It will also permit the resumption of mutual inspections by both parties. They were halted last year when the previous START Treaty, which was signed by the senior Bush in 1991 and ratified shortly thereafter, expired.

The treaty's foes object most strongly to what they claim are inadequate verification provisions and implicit limitations on Washington's ability to develop and deploy missile defences against possible strikes by Iran, North Korea, or other foes, including Russia itself.

"President Reagan knew that in arms control, the U.S. should play to win, and negotiate from a position of strength," wrote Ed Meese of the far-right Heritage Foundation and Richard Perle of the neo-conservative American Enterprise Institute (AEI) in an op-ed also published Thursday in the Wall Street Journal.

Meese served as attorney-general and political adviser to Ronald Reagan, while Perle worked in the same administration as an assistant secretary of defence with some responsibility for arms control negotiations.

"With all the concessions the U.S. made to the Russians to secure this flawed agreement," they argued, the invocation of Reagan's memory both by Obama and the Republican luminaries who have called for ratification was "a brazen act of misappropriation".

Under the U.S. constitution, ratification of a treaty requires two-thirds of the Senate – or 67 of 100 senators – to vote in favour. In the current Senate, Democrats hold 58 seats, so Obama needs only nine Republicans to prevail.

So far, however, only Indiana Sen. Richard Lugar, the ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has come out in strong support of the treaty, although at least half a dozen others have hinted they are prepared to back it, too, under the right circumstances. ➡



**BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION**  
People's Decade for Nuclear Abolition  
Act to make "Freeze" a reality



## Articles

➔ When the new Congress is seated, however, the Democratic majority will be substantially reduced, and Obama will have to persuade at least an additional six Republicans to cross the aisle to gain ratification. While most analysts believe that ratification will still be possible, the president will have to spend much more political capital to prevail.

Because of the evident importance he accords to his nuclear agenda, Obama has already spent quite a lot.

In negotiations with the chief Republican interlocutor on the accord, Sen. John Kyl, last month, the White House agreed to add 4.1 billion dollars to 80 billion for a proposed five-year nuclear arms modernisation programme, a key demand of the arms control sceptics.

The administration was stunned when Kyl and other Republicans announced last month that he still had questions about the modernisation programme and missile defence and that there wasn't enough time left in the year to take up the treaty.

In a letter released Wednesday, the directors of the country's three national nuclear laboratories wrote to Lugar and Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman John Kerry that they were "very pleased" with the plans which, they went on, would "provide adequate support to sustain the safety, security, reliability and effectiveness of America's nuclear deterrent within the limit of 1,550 deployed strategic warheads established by the New START Treaty with adequate confidence and acceptable risk."

While the treaty's supporters insisted that the scientists' assurances should be adequate to gather sufficient support for ratification now, it appears that Obama is willing to pay much more to secure ratification.

Indeed, Republicans, whose top priority at the moment is securing extensions of the sweeping Bush-era tax cuts on the country's wealthiest citizens, appear now to be holding out for Obama's concessions on that front before committing themselves to a vote on New START. The tax cuts, which were enacted shortly after the 9/11 attacks, are due to expire at the end of the month.

Obama, who had promised during the 2008 election campaign not to raise taxes on households earning 250,000 dollars a year or less, had hoped that allowing the cuts to expire on those earning more than that would help cut the federal deficit by several hundred billion dollars over the next few years.

His apparent willingness to compromise on this issue in order to secure START is causing growing dismay among his supporters.

"(Y)es, the Senate should ratify the New START treaty with Russia before the end of the year," wrote E.J. Dionne in his weekly Washington Post column Thursday, "though what does it say about us as a country when the president has to offer a tax-cut payoff to get a key foreign policy initiative through."

As Obama has suggested flexibility on the tax-cut issue, however, a growing number of Senate Republicans, including Kyl, have suggested that there may yet be time to ratify START before the Congress adjourns.

Indeed, a sufficient number of Republicans have indicated their support that Congressional aides were confidently predicting Thursday that the treaty will be brought up before the Senate as early as late next week, once the tax issue is resolved.

"It's a two-step process," Lugar said Wednesday. "We do taxes and then we do START." ■



# BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

People's Decade for Nuclear Abolition  
Act to make the world safer



## Articles

### Nuclear Disarmament Has a Future

By Jamshed Baruah

BERLIN - The United Nations is keen to counter growing skepticism about nuclear disarmament really happening and culminating into a nuke free world. According to the UN High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Sergio Duarte, the peoples and countries of the world are not willing to hang on to nuclear weapons and put at risk all that has been accomplished in building international interdependence.



Duarte, a Brazilian diplomat, believes that nations will not be misled into "illusory national security benefits produced by clinging on to these obsolete, costly, and inherently dangerous weapons -- weapons that are widely viewed as illegitimate and inhumane. . . . This gives me at least some hope for the future. In terms of preventing nuclear threats, there is no alternative policy that does this better than eliminating such weapons."

Nuclear disarmament therefore does indeed have a future, Duarte told an international seminar in Buenos Aires, Argentina, on November 4, 2010, and added: "It is the right thing to do. And it works,"

This is evidenced by the fact that disarmament agencies are making their appearance in the nuclear-weapon States, domestic laws and regulations addressing the implementation of disarmament commitments are being enacted, and budgets are being earmarked for disarmament activities.

Also, domestic laboratories, companies, and organizations mandated to undertake disarmament responsibilities are coming up, weapons are actually being physically destroyed in large numbers, and substantial new information is being provided about the size and disposition of nuclear arsenals and their fissile materials and delivery systems in all possessor States, along with other detailed data on concrete disarmament actions.

Duarte, who is also UN Under-Secretary-General, is pleased that several of the nuclear-weapon States have in recent years published additional details about their respective arsenals. Such information is important in the wider process of strengthening accountability and transparency in implementing disarmament commitments.

Duarte recalls that as part of his five-point nuclear disarmament proposal in October 2008, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon invited States in possession of nukes to submit such information to the UN Secretariat to encourage its wider dissemination.

#### ACTION 21

This idea was incorporated in Action 21 of the recommendations adopted at the 2010 NPT (Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty) Review Conference, which invited the Secretary-General to establish a "publicly accessible repository" of such information. Action 21 also invited these States to adopt a "standardized reporting form" for this purpose and to agree on appropriate reporting intervals.

The nuclear-weapon States will be meeting in Paris in April 2011 for their first follow-up meeting after the Review Conference in May 2010 and the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs will establish a repository on its web site for reporting this information.

So where in conclusion is nuclear disarmament heading? Will the world accept the "fewer nukes" solution offered by asymptotic disarmament policies as sufficient? "Probably not -- certainly no more than the nuclear-weapon States would accept partial commitments to nuclear non-proliferation," said Duarte.

And if given the facts on the risks posed by a world without nuclear disarmament and with endless proliferation, might the last stubborn sources of resistance to disarmament start to reconsider? "Maybe so, at least this would open up the possibility of achieving, as President Obama said in Prague in April 2009, the 'peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons'," the UN High Representative for Disarmament Affairs said. ➡



# BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

People's Decade for Nuclear Abolition  
Act to make "No First Use" a reality



## Articles

➔ In a landmark speech, Duarte also referred to critics of the step-by-step approach to disarmament who often view it as a kind of game involving the rolling out of condition after condition, with the net result that disarmament becomes merely a distant vision, an ultimate objective, or the top of what has been called a "misty mountaintop".

The use of conditions or preconditions as a kind of subterfuge for avoiding real disarmament activities is however hardly new. Alva Myrdal's 1976 book, titled 'The Game of Disarmament', contains this observation about how the game was played during the Cold War:

"...both sides would present proposals for disarmament agreement, of often wholesale dimensions, but would be careful to see to it that these would contain conditions which the opposite side could not accept. This is the way disarmament was, and is, continually torpedoed."

Duarte said: "Today we do not see many proposals for comprehensive approaches to disarmament, at least not along the lines of 'general and complete disarmament under effective international control', which the General Assembly's first Special Session on disarmament in 1978 established as the UN's 'ultimate objective' in this field."

Instead, there is a proliferation of preconditions for disarmament, and many indications that this game has acquired new players and some new rules, but it remains in many ways the same old game.

### PRECONDITIONS

Proposals to defer disarmament until world peace can first be achieved fall into this category, as do calls to postpone this progress until all WMD (weapons of mass destruction) proliferation threats can first be eliminated, all regional disputes are first settled, the risk of WMD terrorism is first reduced to zero, all dangerous WMD-related materials are first completely accounted for and placed under infallible security controls, and of course, there must also first be a solution to the problem of war.

The result of -- and the real purpose of -- all these preconditions is to postpone indefinitely the achievement of disarmament, said Duarte.

The same point is true with respect to those who argue that disarmament must await a fundamental transformation of human consciousness and the dawn of an entirely new society based on non-violence, and the withering away of all national militaries or even the nation state itself.

But unlike the previous approach, those who favour these types of preconditions have no interest whatsoever in preserving nuclear weapons forever, argued Duarte. "They have just come to question the conclusion that incremental, step-by-step negotiations and adjustments to the current system of international security will be sufficient to produce a nuclear-weapon-free world.

"Their radical prescription is not based so much on utopianism or fanciful idealism, as it is on a frustrated response to 'business as usual' in the ongoing game of disarmament -- a game in which disarmament is honoured more with words than with concrete deeds."

Yet this is not at all the whole story of how disarmament has been addressed at the United Nations.

Historically, the UN disarmament machinery, which consists of the UN Disarmament Commission, the General Assembly's First Committee, and the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, has served as a mechanism for establishing and maintaining multilateral norms. Its goals are quite clear, and have been for over six decades -- namely, the elimination of all weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, biological, and chemical) and the limitation or regulation of conventional arms. But this is not all that has been achieved -- a mere agreement on final goals.

Duarte said, this complex and ongoing multilateral process has also generated a consensus in the world community on certain standards that should apply to disarmament agreements -- standards that governments and citizens everywhere should use in assessing such agreements, to judge whether they are real or not. ➔



# BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

People's Decade for Nuclear Abolition  
Act to make it a reality



## Articles

☛ "These standards are not put forward as conditions or preconditions for disarmament to occur -- they are simply criteria that enable us all to conclude with high confidence that disarmament is actually occurring."

These five standards can easily be found in literally hundreds of General Assembly resolutions and in deliberations throughout the NPT review process, including the final documents adopted at the end of the five-year Review Conferences, explained Duarte.

The first of these standards is verification, which encompasses all the various means -- both national and international -- that enable States to confirm that other States are fully complying with their obligations.

While unilateral declarations do have their limited roles to play in the process in disarmament -- as seen in the parallel Presidential Nuclear Initiatives in 1991 involving the removal from deployment of thousands of short- range tactical nuclear weapons by the United States and the Russian Federation -- such declarations cannot suffice as a means to achieve zero, Duarte stated.

But verification is not the only standard that helps States to reassure themselves that cheating is not occurring -- transparency serves a similar purpose. Both of these are confidence builders. In fact, it is very difficult to imagine how the world will ever get to zero without comprehensive, verified data on the numbers of nuclear weapons, the quantities of fissile material, and nuclear-weapon delivery systems. Transparency enables the world to witness disarmament as it is underway, and to gauge its progress in achieving elimination.

The third standard is irreversibility -- this is yet another confidence-building measure the world community has agreed is important in future disarmament agreements, a measure deemed essential in avoiding strategic surprises, or sudden attempts to reverse disarmament commitments, said Duarte.

"Irreversibility underscores the need to erect formidable political and technical barriers to abandoning disarmament commitments, barriers that are reinforced by the other operating standards of verification and transparency. The goal here is not only to discourage reversals, but also to be able to detect them in time to discourage them or to prepare collective international responses. Ideally, the goal of irreversibility is not only to make reversals unlikely, but impossible."

As important as they are, these three standards of verification, transparency, and irreversibility are still not alone sufficient to lead to a world free of nuclear weapons, the UN's High Representative for Disarmament Affairs noted.

The fourth standard -- one of universality -- holds that nuclear disarmament is not something to be undertaken only by some countries. It is instead a solemn responsibility of all countries. This certainly is true with respect to all States Parties of the NPT, who have this explicit obligation in Article VI of the Treaty.

Yet it is also a theme in Security Council resolution 1887, which was adopted at the Council's high-level summit on September 24, 2009 last year, explained Duarte. In that resolution, the Council called upon all States -- not just those party to the NPT -- to join in pursuing negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to nuclear arms reduction and disarmament, as well as on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

Nuclear disarmament is widely supported in the world today because it is seen as a legitimate goal -- legitimate in having been agreed upon through an open democratic process, and legitimate because of its substantive fairness in not attempting to apply a double standard, Duarte went on to say.

The last standard relates to all of the above -- namely, bindingness. Because the world will not achieve zero based solely on toasts, press releases, or speeches about lofty mountaintops, he added. Nuclear weapons are the most dangerous weapons on earth, so it should not be at all surprising that the world community would absolutely insist upon the strictest possible standards to establish and to maintain a nuclear-weapon free world.

Treaty commitments play an indispensable role in nailing down concrete commitments, and in giving these commitments some permanence and sustainability. This is why it is important to pursue a nuclear weapons convention or a framework of mutually-reinforcing instruments with the same goal. (IDN-InDepthNews/15.12.2010) ■





## **Translations | Adaptations**

### **Eliminating Nuclear Weapons: Education is Central**

Viewpoint by Kathleen Sullivan

[http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=316:nukes-education&catid=16:nuclear-abolition-news-and-analysis&Itemid=17](http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=316:nukes-education&catid=16:nuclear-abolition-news-and-analysis&Itemid=17)

#### **JAPANESE**

[http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=319:2010-12-26-14-52-14&catid=2:japanese&Itemid=3](http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=319:2010-12-26-14-52-14&catid=2:japanese&Itemid=3)

### **Obama Scores Win with New START Ratification**

<http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=53944>

#### **ARABIC**

<http://www.ipsinternational.org/arabic/nota.asp?idnews=2051>

#### **JAPANESE**

[http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=328:start-obama&catid=2:japanese&Itemid=3](http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=328:start-obama&catid=2:japanese&Itemid=3)

#### **SPANISH**

<http://www.ipsnoticias.net/nota.asp?idnews=97195>

### **Debunking the Nuclear Deterrence Myth**

<http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=53826>

#### **ARABIC**

<http://www.ipsinternational.org/arabic/nota.asp?idnews=2040>

#### **GERMAN**

[http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=310:nukleare-abschreckung&catid=5:german&Itemid=6](http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=310:nukleare-abschreckung&catid=5:german&Itemid=6)

#### **JAPANESE**

[http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=314:2010-12-21-14-19-13&catid=2:japanese&Itemid=3](http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=314:2010-12-21-14-19-13&catid=2:japanese&Itemid=3)

#### **TURKISH**

<http://ipsinternational.org/tr/news.asp?idnews=128>

### **Obama Pushes START Treaty to Top of Legislative Agenda**

<http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=53758>

#### **ARABIC**

<http://www.ipsinternational.org/arabic/nota.asp?idnews=2032>

#### **JAPANESE**

[http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=311:obama-start&catid=2:japanese&Itemid=3](http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=311:obama-start&catid=2:japanese&Itemid=3)

#### **TURKISH**

<http://ipsinternational.org/tr/news.asp?idnews=129>



# BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

People's Decade for Nuclear Abolition  
Act to make the world nuclear free



## Civil Society's Perspective

### North Korea on the brink in a nuclear world

By James Norman and Jim Green\*

A state-run website in North Korea has already warned that the military exercises constitute an "unpardonable provocation" and that any violation of its territory would result in "sea of fire" in the Korean Peninsula. It's easy to dismiss such provocative Cold-War-style rhetoric, but the frightening reality is that while nuclear weapons are a part of the bargain no nation can ever feel safe to ignore the bellicose belligerence of any regional power, no matter how maniacal they sound.

North Korea's shelling of a South Korean island located just over 100 kilometres from Seoul is one of its most serious provocations in years. But add this episode to the recent litany of provocations – the sinking of a South Korean vessel earlier this year killing 46 sailors (North Korea denied responsibility but many observers are unconvinced), last year's illegal testing of ballistic missiles, and the regimes regular tirades against their southern "enemy" – and it becomes clear that the North Korea is engaging in the most disturbing form of megaphone diplomacy.

One may ask then why it should have come as such a surprise when US scientist Siegfried S. Hecker, visiting North Korea, reported being "stunned" by the sophistication of a vast new facility the country has secretly built to enrich uranium. Hecker discovered the enrichment plant in a recently gutted building in North Korea on November 12, containing what he has described in The New York Times as an "ultra-modern" control room where up to 2000 centrifuges were installed and running.

What proponents of nuclear power often fail to understand is the frequent connection between nuclear power programs and weapons programs. North Korea provides one of the most pressing examples of this. North Korea's nuclear weapons tests in 2006 and 2009 used plutonium produced in an "experimental power reactor". Needless to say, many regard it as a military reactor but the ambiguity about the purpose of the reactor provided the regime with important time and political wriggle-room to advance its weapons program.

As outlined in its 2001-02 report (page 15), the Australian Safeguards and Non-proliferation Office used AusAid funding to provide safeguards training to North Korean nuclear officials. In hindsight, if the North Korean regime had any interest in the international safeguards inspection system, it could only have been to learn how best to circumvent them. The connections between nuclear power and weapons are well documented and even have a precedent in Australia.

Prime minister John Gorton had military ambitions for the power reactor he pushed to have constructed in the late 1960s at Jervis Bay on the NSW north coast. He admitted 20 years later and reported by The Sydney Morning Herald in 1999: "We were interested in this thing because it could provide electricity to everybody and it could, if you decided later on, it could make an atomic bomb." That particular reactor plan was cancelled by the Whitlam government, which went on to support the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, but in other countries weapons have been developed under the cover of nuclear power programs and now we are starting to see the pernicious harvest of such arrangements all over the world, such as in North Korea, Iran and India. These concerns could spread in North-East Asia and into the Middle East in the future.

The US National Intelligence Council argued in a 2008 report that: "The spread of nuclear technologies and expertise is generating concerns about the potential emergence of new nuclear weapon states and the acquisition of nuclear materials by terrorist groups." The Council also warned of the possibility of a nuclear arms race in the Middle East and noted that a number of states in the region "are already thinking about developing or acquiring nuclear technology useful for development of nuclear weaponry".

The harsh reality for Australia is that while our nation continues to export uranium to an ever-expanding global customer base, which now includes Russia under a deal ratified by Julia Gillard at the sidelines of the recent G20 Summit in South Korea, we are effectively adding to a sense of growing nuclear insecurity globally.

Theoretically, Australia could raise the bar and lift expectations and standards through stricter conditions attached to uranium exports. The government could, for example, insist that Japan stops separating and stockpiling the weapons-useable plutonium produced from Australian uranium. But it doesn't. The Howard government could have taken a stand when it was revealed that South Korea - one of Australia's largest uranium customers - had undertaken a wide range of secret nuclear weapons-related experiments from 1979-2004. But it didn't. The Gillard government could have followed the advice of Parliament's treaties committee and insisted on safeguards inspections in Russia before signing off on a uranium supply agreement. But it didn't. Instead, we are constantly told that Australia's "strict" safeguards conditions "ensure" that our uranium will remain in peaceful use. While the world allows nuclear weapons (and by association nuclear power) to be developed and normalised, we will have to live with an unthinkable existential threat to our very survival. ■

\*James Norman is a Melbourne writer and journalist, and communications co-ordinator for the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons. Dr Jim Green is the co-ordinator of the Choose Nuclear Free Project. (December 2, 2010)



## Civil Society's Perspective

### **Nuclear arms treaty merely a start**

**By James Norman\***

After a week in which the US Senate voted overwhelmingly in favour of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty with Russia, the victory is being seen as the Obama administration's most significant foreign policy achievement.

Ratified by a clear majority of 71-26 just a few hours before the US senators set off for their Christmas break, the historic treaty will leave the Democrats with a much-needed boost to take into their holiday seasons.

However, the question that must be asked is how much is this victory a symbolic one when it comes to the very real challenge of removing the threat of nuclear weapons? While the passing of the treaty may mark what President Barack Obama has called "a season of progress", the reality is that this is a small step on the road towards the larger goal of abolishing nuclear weapons.

The treaty will reduce the strategic warheads deployed by each country to 1550 within seven years (still enough to effectively eliminate life on earth as we know it several times over). The weasel word in the equation is "deployed". In reality, both the US and Russia will retain thousands more weapons than this in their non-deployed arsenals, including hundreds of sub-strategic US weapons scattered across Europe.

Moreover, the treaty comes at a time when both the US and Russia continue to modernise their arsenals, and the US has plans to spend more than \$85 billion over the next 10 years to rebuild its nuclear weapons research and production complex. Such moves, should they proceed, would serve to undermine the progress that New START promises by simultaneously working in counter to the pledges to work towards a weapons-free world.

Obama pledged his presidential leadership on a very high-minded vision in Prague last year when he stated: "Some argue that we are destined to live in a world where more nations and more people possess the ultimate tools of destruction. Such fatalism is a deadly adversary, for if we believe the spread of nuclear weapons is inevitable, in some way we are admitting to ourselves that the use of nuclear weapons is inevitable.

"So today I state, clearly and with conviction, America's commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons."

Strong, stirring words that contributed towards building the hope of people all over the world that abolishing nuclear weapons is more than just an optimistic fantasy: it is an urgent necessity that is suddenly achievable.

The New START treaty also poses questions for Australia and its place in contributing towards a world constantly threatened by the spectre of nuclear weapons. As we have seen recently on the Korean peninsula, the reality of living in a nuclear-armed world is that regional diplomacy can take on a deadly dimension almost overnight. The consequences can be diabolical for those countries unfortunate enough to be sucked into its deadly orbit.

The New START treaty comes at a time when Australia has recently agreed to supply uranium to Russia, despite it being notoriously non-transparent to outside observers of its weapons programs. In fact, we know the International Atomic Energy Agency hasn't carried out a single inspection of Russia's nuclear weapons arsenal in the past decade.

As Australia has set its sights on becoming the salesperson to about 30 per cent of the global uranium market, it has an obligation to ensure our uranium sales are not fuelling potentially explosive global tensions.

Our focus must equally be on moving away from any new programs - including programs linked to Australian uranium exports - that will continue to endanger people all over the world for decades to come. While the New START treaty takes us some way down that road of nuclear weapons abolition Obama dared to dream aloud in Prague, we all need to keep a reality check on what is actually achievable.

Last week, the Senate took a crucial first step in the right direction with the ratification of the treaty. But rather than an end in itself, the focus should be on ways to accelerate the liberation of the world from the great existential threat these weapons represent. ■

---

\* James Norman is communications co-ordinator for the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons. This article first appeared in The Australian newspaper on December 28, 2010



## Civil Society's Perspective

### **Nuclear treaty success re-opens space for disarmament, says CND**

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament strongly welcomes the anticipated passage of the new START-replacement treaty, expected to be voted upon by the US Senate later today. Britain's leading anti-nuclear campaigners expressed hope that its successful ratification will "re-open the space for further disarmament measures by the US, Russia and other states – measures we desperately need to reduce and ultimately rid the world of the most deadly of weapons".

The pact, signed by Presidents Obama and Medvedev on April 8th, is expected to be ratified later today after sufficient votes were pledged to take it beyond the two-thirds majority required. It succeeds the 1991 START I treaty and sets warhead limits 30% lower than those in the 2002 Moscow Treaty – the most recent arms limitation agreement.

Kate Hudson, General Secretary of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, said "This is a significant advance for disarmament, enacting real reductions in the size of the nuclear forces deployed by the US and Russia. They both retain the ability to destroy all life on earth, but reducing the size of their deployed forces lessens the possibility of accidents or unauthorised launches on either side.

"The months of uncertainty over whether this treaty would succeed had cast doubt on whether the positive momentum created by President Obama could be sustained. With this hurdle cleared, the US Administration should seek to maximise the practical steps it can take immediately, without any need for legislation, for example reducing the 'alert state' of their weapon systems as well as permanently disabling the thousands of retired warheads in their stockpile. Parallel to this, negotiations should commence on a treaty which would encompass all US and Russian nuclear weapons – including the 'smaller' tactical weapons which are ignored in the new START agreement.

"Today's vote re-opens the space for further disarmament measures by the US, Russia and other states – measures we desperately need to reduce and ultimately rid the world of the most deadly of weapons. Whilst the US and Russia have the biggest cuts to make, the other nuclear states who are signatories to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty – Britain, France and China – also made a binding commitment to disarm. All states should be working towards a Nuclear Weapons Convention, which would universally ban nukes in the way that chemical and biological weapons are successfully outlawed." (December 22, 2010) ■

---

### **US Senate does "right thing"; ratifies New START**

[IPPNW has released the following statement, following the announcement that the US Senate, by a vote of 71-26, has ratified the New START agreement between the US and Russia.]

International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War praised the US Senate for "doing the right thing" today in ratifying the New START agreement between the US and Russia, and called on the Russian Duma to quickly follow suit and bring the treaty into force. IPPNW chair Bjorn Hilt of Norway said the treaty is a modest but welcome step toward a world without nuclear weapons, and urged the leaders of the two largest nuclear-weapon states to waste no time in negotiating much deeper cuts in their arsenals in the new year.

"Even with the New START," Dr. Hilt said, "the US and Russia continue to deploy thousands of nuclear weapons that contribute nothing to the security of their people, endanger the rest of the world, and give other countries an excuse to retain or acquire nuclear weapons of their own.

"Presidents Obama and Medvedev deserve credit for pushing this treaty through to a successful conclusion. We hope they will now take bold new steps to make good on their promise that the small reductions guaranteed by this Senate vote are merely a 'down payment' on the nuclear-weapons-free world to which they have pledged their leadership. The sooner all the nuclear powers can get to work on a global nuclear disarmament agreement, the better."

IPPNW warned that modernization of the large arsenals still possessed by the US and Russia would undermine the progress made by the New START, and criticized US plans to spend more than \$85 billion over the next 10 years to rebuild its nuclear weapons research and production complex.

"The focus after today must be on ways to accelerate the liberation of the world from these weapons of mass annihilation," said Dr. Hilt, "not on programs to ensure that they will continue to endanger us for decades to come." (December 22, 2010) ■



## What Others Say

### **Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Issues \***

**By Hannelore Hoppe**

**Director and Deputy to the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs United Nations**

[. . .] The conferences organized jointly by the Republic of Korea and the United Nations constitute the “Jeju Process”, which was started nine years ago by the former UN Department for Disarmament Affairs and the Republic of Korea. It has served well as a forum for engaging in an exchange of views on pressing challenges in disarmament and non-proliferation, and for exploring practical solutions.

The Republic of Korea has certainly played an important role in the international arena, on a wide range of political, security, economic, and social issues. The recent G20 summit in Seoul and the Government’s initiative to host the next Nuclear Security Summit in 2012 are excellent examples of such contributions in the common interest.

Today, in Jeju, we will focus on the global expansion of nuclear energy, in its wider security context.

The growing interest in nuclear energy is largely a product of global energy demands and concerns over energy security and climate change—conditions that have led many to predict the advent of a “Nuclear Renaissance”. Nuclear-related technologies also have important applications in fields such as human health, food and agriculture, environment and water resources. Safe and efficient use of nuclear energy could help to advance the well-being of States and their peoples, to achieve key UN Millennium Development Goals, and to benefit the environment.

Recognizing such interests, some experts predict that global nuclear energy capacity could double or triple by 2050, though this would involve the introduction of new types of reactors and sensitive nuclear technologies in various parts of the world.

Yet any serious examination of the challenge of promoting the peaceful uses of nuclear energy must also consider some closely related issues, such as enhancing nuclear safety and security, preventing nuclear terrorism, and the advancing of nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament goals.

Concern with these wider issues is why the peaceful uses of nuclear energy are only one of the three pillars of the NPT. Together with disarmament and nonproliferation, these pillars constitute the “grand bargain” of the Treaty. There is a synergy between these goals, which demands that they be pursued simultaneously because they are mutually reinforcing. This is why we must address nuclear energy in its wider security contexts, as suggested by the title of this Conference.

Fortunately, many efforts have been underway in the world to address these challenges, especially with respect to nuclear safety, security and proliferation. These efforts have established a foundation for cooperation both for establishing a robust international safety and security regime, as well as for strengthening nuclear safeguards.

There are, of course, daunting challenges ahead that will require political leadership, financial investment and closely coordinated multilateral activities.

At the Nuclear Security Summit held in Washington, D.C. last April, Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon suggested five areas where global action is required: preventing nuclear terrorism; securing nuclear fissile materials; strengthening the International Atomic Energy Agency; increasing the engagement of the Security Council; and achieving progress on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. ↻

\* Extracts from Opening Statement at the 9th UN/ROK Joint Conference on Jeju, Republic of Korea on December 2, 2010







# BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

People's Decade for Nuclear Abolition  
Act to make it a reality



## What Others Say

➡ Each of these subjects could well provide material for a separate conference of its own, as each involves issues of great complexity. While the IAEA will continue to assist States to ensure that nuclear activities are conducted in a safe, secure and peaceful manner, the world will be facing new challenges in minimizing proliferation risks from sensitive nuclear technologies. Some of these risks might be reduced through proliferation-resistant technology, which many believe is an essential objective in the design and operation of nuclear facilities. The nuclear industry has its own contributions to make in minimizing these proliferation risks. There is also the need for further discussions on the nuclear fuel cycle, including an international fuel bank or possible regional initiatives.

Yet proliferation is hardly the only security challenge ahead. The final communiqué issued at the Washington Nuclear Security Summit also underlined the gravity of the threat of nuclear terrorism. The UN Security Council 1540 Committee, IAEA, and the UN Security Council's Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate are working with Member States to address such challenges.

Important practical measures must be put in place to enhance the physical security of nuclear materials and nuclear facilities in order to reduce to an absolute minimum the risk of nuclear terrorism. It is especially appropriate for this Conference to address this topic given that the next Nuclear Security Summit will be hosted by the Republic of Korea.

In light of all the complexities of the issues we will be addressing at this conference, I hope all participants will keep in mind that our common goals, as reflected most clearly in the NPT grand bargain, extend beyond the realm of non-proliferation and peaceful uses. The world is also working to achieve global nuclear disarmament. This has been a top priority of the United Nations for over six decades and it remains one of the most ardent aspirations of human beings throughout the world. This conference provides an opportunity to discuss issues related to the way forward to advance nuclear disarmament, as we also consider how to strengthen the other two NPT pillars of nonproliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

This year marks the 40th anniversary of entry into force of the NPT, and I am very encouraged by some recent positive developments, including: the Security Council's first Summit on nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament issues in 2009, and several other developments this year, which include the conclusion of the New START Treaty in April, a successful outcome of the NPT Review Conference in May, and a high-level meeting convened by UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon in September on the work on the Conference on Disarmament. It is especially noteworthy that the NPT Review Conference was able to agree this year on 64 specific Actions for strengthening each pillar of the treaty, while also launching a new initiative to revitalize efforts to establish a WMD-free zone in the Middle East.

Yet great challenges obviously remain. While disarmament is coming back on top of the global agenda, this is certainly not a time for complacency. The Conference on Disarmament was once again unable to start negotiations on a fissile material treaty or to address the other important issues on its agenda—and it was this longstanding stalemate that led to the convening of the recent high-level meeting on the CD. The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty has still not entered into force. Protocols to key regional nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties remain un-ratified. And over 20,000 nuclear weapons reportedly continue to exist. Together, we must work to build on what is positive, sustain the momentum for disarmament, and persist in our efforts to achieve concrete results.

In closing, I would like to say a few words about the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific (UNRCPD). Since its relocation to Nepal, the Centre has strengthened its capacity to undertake regional activities related to disarmament, taking into account specific situations and practical needs of States in the region. It also continues to promote regional dialogue and confidence building on disarmament, non-proliferation and security matters through various activities, including this annual Conference. ■



# BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

People's Decade for Nuclear Abolition  
Act to make 1995 a turning point



## What Others Say

### UN High Representative's Speaking Event



### Global Nuclear Disarmament after 2010: Expressway or Cul-de-Sac? Worldview Institute Seminar Hosted by United Nations Association of New York, 8 December 2010

<http://www.un.org/disarmament/HomePage/HR/docs/2010/2010December8UNA-USA.pdf>

2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)  
3-28 May 2010

NPT Text | UN & Disarmament | Disarmament Issues | Resources

UN Home  
Home  
Background  
Officers  
Provisional List of Participants  
Secretariat  
Statements  
Speakers List  
Webcast  
Documents  
Side Events  
Media Information  
NGO Information

"A world free of nuclear weapons would be a global public good of the highest order."  
*United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon  
in his address to the East-West Institute, 24 October 2008*

The 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) will be held in May 2010 at UN Headquarters in New York. The President-elect of the Review Conference is Ambassador Libran II. Cabactulan of the Philippines.

The NPT is a landmark international treaty whose objective is to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology, to promote cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and to further the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament. The NPT represents the only binding commitment in a multilateral treaty to the goal of disarmament by the nuclear-weapon States.

Conferences to review the operation of the Treaty have been held at five-year intervals since the Treaty went into effect in 1970. Each conference has sought to find agreement on a final declaration that would assess the implementation of the Treaty's provisions and make recommendations on measures to further strengthen it.

The 2010 Review Conference is expected to consider a number of key issues, including: universality of the Treaty; nuclear disarmament, including specific practical measures; nuclear non-proliferation, including the promoting and strengthening of safeguards; measures to advance the peaceful use of nuclear energy, safety and security; regional disarmament and non-proliferation; implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East; measures to address withdrawal from the Treaty; measures to further strengthen the review process; and ways to promote engagement with civil society in strengthening NPT norms and in promoting disarmament education.

Copyright | Terms of Use | Privacy Notice | Site Index | Fraud Alert | Help  
UN Web Services Section, Department of Public Information, United Nations © 2010

Publisher: IPS-Inter Press Service Deutschland gGmbH, Berlin  
SGI-IPS Project Director: Katsuhiko Asagiri, President IPS Japan, Tokyo  
SGI-IPS Project Coordinator & Editor-in-Charge: Ramesh Jaura  
© 2010 IPS-Inter Press Service