



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

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



Number 06 | 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.

[Visit Compilation of Articles April 2009-March 2010](#)

http://www.nuclearabolition.net/documents/Beyond_Nuclear_Non-Proliferation.pdf

[Articles](#)

Eastern Europe: Unwilling to Back Full Nuclear Disarmament

More than a year ago U.S. President Barack Obama came to Eastern Europe to announce his vision of a world without nuclear weapons. One year later, in the same place, the Czech capital Prague, he signed a deal slashing nuclear weapons stocks with his Russian counterpart Dmitri Medvedev. Many commentators saw the choice of location as symbolic -- one of the most prominent capitals in a region where nuclear weapons had been deployed in the depths of the Cold War when the world was thought to be its closest yet to nuclear war. <http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=52994>

Russia: New START May End With a Whimper

Efforts by the U.S. and Russian governments to move speedily towards the abolition of strategic nuclear weapons have hit stumbling blocks and continue to generate debates among experts about the practicality of achieving a nuclear-free world in the near future. The main point, experts say, is that Russia and the U.S. have only taken weak steps to fulfil the objectives of the first strategic arms reduction treaty signed in 1991. "Russia assigns significant military utility to its nuclear arsenal and so has less interest than the U.S. in promoting nuclear disarmament. For instance, it maintains several thousand tactical nuclear weapons in western Russia to counterbalance NATO's conventional military superiority," Ben Rhode, a research associate for non-proliferation and disarmament at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London told IPS in an e-mail interview.

<http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=52723>

Dangerous Nuclear Game in the Middle East

The Middle East panorama is now gloomier. The six-decade long conflict has been further aggravated by a dangerous nuclear game. Israel continues to refuse joining the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The U.S. clogs all attempts to declare the Middle East an atomic free-zone. And the Arabs accelerate their nuclear rush. Furthermore, the ongoing U.S. imposed round of direct negotiations between Israelis and Palestinians seems to have entered a new dead end. No wonder, the forced launch of this new negotiating round appears to be rather motivated by the U.S. democratic administration's efforts to counter-balance the Republican and neo-conservative strong electoral campaign for the November's legislative partial elections.

<http://www.indepthnews.net/news/news.php?key1=2010-09-27%2016:57:39&key2=1>

German Anti-Nuke Movement Withers Away

They have long disappeared from the scene, those hundreds of thousands of peace activists who call for the removal of atomic arsenal from German territory. They dominated the political landscape when NATO, the western military alliance, officially installed nuclear weapons in Germany at the height of the Cold War nearly 30 years ago. Today, those participating in peace demonstrations can be counted by the dozens.

<http://www.indepthnews.net/news/news.php?key1=2010-09-17%2000:47:03&key2=1>

[Translations | Adaptations](#)

[Civil Society's Perspective](#)

[What Others Say](#)



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON- PROLIFERATION



Compilation of Articles April 2009-March 2010

This document is part of a project aimed to strengthen public awareness of the urgent need for nuclear abolition. The Tokyo-based Soka Gakkai International (SGI), a Buddhist association, and the Inter Press Service global news agency initiated a media project in April 2009, which aimed to help shed light on the issue of nuclear abolition from the perspectives of civil society through the global media network of IPS and its partners such as the Global Perspectives.

The journalistic articles, reproduced here, were published on the Internet and are available online at: www.ipsnews.net/new_focus/nuclear/index.asp and www.nuclearabolition.net

This document is available at > http://www.nuclearabolition.net/documents/Beyond_Nuclear_Non-Proliferation.pdf

**B
E
Y
O
N
D**



Nuclear Non-Proliferation



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

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



Articles

Eastern Europe: Unwilling to Back Full Nuclear Disarmament

Pavol Stracansky interviews Czech analyst Tomas Karasek

PRAGUE, Sep 29, 2010 (IPS) - More than a year ago U.S. President Barack Obama came to Eastern Europe to announce his vision of a world without nuclear weapons. One year later, in the same place, the Czech capital Prague, he signed a deal slashing nuclear weapons stocks with his Russian counterpart Dmitri Medvedev.

Many commentators saw the choice of location as symbolic -- one of the most prominent capitals in a region where nuclear weapons had been deployed in the depths of the Cold War when the world was thought to be its closest yet to nuclear war.

But its choice also stood at odds with what analysts say is a societal indifference to the debate on nuclear abolition matched only by its leaders' diffidence in committing to fully backing a Global Zero plan for nuclear weapons. Prominent Czech international relations analyst Tomas Karasek of the Association for International Affairs in Prague explained to IPS the reasons why full nuclear disarmament is unlikely to ever get the region's political support.



between the two is highly unrealistic. But in a situation when Russia still maintains its nuclear arsenal, it's simply politically unacceptable, and not just among the CEE leaders, that NATO would abolish its own. Since it's hardly imaginable Russia would accept total abolition of nuclear weapons which are one of the few remaining sources of its international prestige, such a development is also highly unlikely.

Q: U.S. President Barack Obama has said he wants to push for a world free of nuclear weapons and the UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon has said he sees world leaders wanting the same. Do you think that leaders in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) hold the same view? Would they fully back nuclear abolition?

A: I doubt it. Though I think it's difficult to defend the benefits of nuclear weapons publicly, they are regarded as an essential component of NATO's defence and deterrence strategies. In relation to the possibility of a terrorist attack by WMDs (weapons of mass destruction) but also vis-a-vis Russia, I believe many key players in the foreign policy and defence establishments in CEE still regard nuclear deterrent as a necessary (though not necessarily immediately usable) component of NATO policies.

Q: It has been suggested that some Central European leaders might not want complete nuclear abolition as it would mean the U.S. abandoning tactical nuclear weapons in Europe which raises concerns over regional security with the might of Russia's military on its doorstep. Do you think there is any real security reason for leaders in the region not to support complete abolition of nuclear weapons?

A: From a purely military perspective it's probably fair to assume that NATO could defend itself against a conventional Russian attack even without the use of nuclear weapons, while emphasising that such a scenario of a military confrontation.

Q: Not being nuclear powers, could Central and Eastern European countries ever have any real influence on moves to abolish or even limit nuclear weapons or their testing?

A: Vis-a-vis the U.S., the CEE countries could at least send strong signals of disapproval to such American policies which they regard as grossly unfavourable. This could include withdrawal from U.S.-led missions, example Afghanistan, or stronger inclination to ESDP (the EU's European Security and Defence Policy) as an alternative to NATO. However, such developments are not very likely. In practice, the countries of Central and Eastern Europe would probably simply 'lobby' the U.S. government to modify its steps to fit their perceived needs and interests. Since the U.S. cannot completely ignore the voices of its (Eastern) European allies, such diplomatic negotiations have a reasonable chance of at least partial success.

Q: Does the region have any role to play globally in at least stopping the spread of nuclear weapons, perhaps because of its Cold War history and the fact that nuclear weapons were deployed in the region under communism?

A: Probably not beyond participation in NATO and EU policies and initiatives.

Q: In the light of what critics said was a disappointing outcome to the non-proliferation treaty review earlier this year, could, or should, Central and Eastern Europe do more to show its ↻



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

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



Articles

➤ support for non-proliferation, or a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty?

A: Even if they did, I doubt their weight in the international system would make it a significant move. The problem with the review of the non-proliferation treaty lies in the effort to change it into a disarmament instrument -- a move the current owners of nuclear weapons simply will not accept, despite all rhetorical dances. In fact, missing in the zeal towards disarmament is a clear explanation of why in fact the ownership of nuclear weapons is in itself a bad thing.

Q: Under communism nuclear weapons were deployed in the region but since the fall of communism and their withdrawal nuclear weapons seem to have been a relatively low subject on the political and public agenda in Central and Eastern Europe. Why do you think this is?

A: First, with the disappearance of the Soviet threat and the risk of U.S.-Soviet military confrontation, nuclear weapons ceased to be a relevant issue in regional discourse on security threats. Even discussion on the link between terrorism and WMDs after 9/11 did not result in plans for more reliance on nuclear weapons as a deterrent, not the least because of the official U.S. position that suicide terrorism simply cannot be deterred, or defence, taking into account the political and human costs of a hypothetical response to terrorist attacks by nuclear weapons.

Q: The UN has recently held meetings with high-level representatives of various governments in a bid to push for a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty, and disarmament education in schools. Do you think Central and Eastern European governments will back these plans and even if they do, do you think they are realistic goals?

A: Personally, I am a bit sceptical about this, not the least because I tend to assess the role of nuclear weapons in international relations in much more positive terms than the prevailing disarmament discourse. In my opinion, any education on these matters should include a fair and critical assessment of the role of nuclear weapons in the international system along with the virtues of disarmament, in order to prevent turning education into indoctrination. ■

Russia: New START May End With a Whimper

Analysis by Kester Kenn Klomegah

MOSCOW, Sep 4, 2010 (IPS) - Efforts by the U.S. and Russian governments to move speedily towards the abolition of strategic nuclear weapons have hit stumbling blocks and continue to generate debates among experts about the practicality of achieving a nuclear-free world in the near future.

The main point, experts say, is that Russia and the U.S. have only taken weak steps to fulfil the objectives of the first strategic arms reduction treaty signed in 1991.

"Russia assigns significant military utility to its nuclear arsenal and so has less interest than the U.S. in promoting nuclear disarmament. For instance, it maintains several thousand tactical nuclear weapons in western Russia to counterbalance NATO's conventional military superiority," Ben Rhode, a research associate for non-proliferation and disarmament at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London told IPS in an e-mail interview.

"Many in the West have said such weapons will need to be included in future arms control talks, but I don't know how enthusiastic Russia would be about this. A world free of nuclear weapons would see the U.S.'s military superiority increased, and Russia would lose one of the very few ways in which it can justify its claims to be a great power."

The first Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, or START expired in December 2009. The new START agreement, signed on Apr. 8, 2010 by the Russian and U.S. presidents in Prague (and followed by the first round of negotiations in Moscow from May 18 to 20) has allowed Russia to limit U.S. nuclear forces at the expense of its own rapidly aging delivery vehicles and unattainable warhead ceilings – each country being limited to 1,550 strategic warheads on 700 delivery vehicles. ➤



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON- PROLIFERATION

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



Articles

But, Robert Orttung, a senior fellow at the Jefferson Institute in Washington, DC, told IPS: "In order to keep the past achievements valid and in force, the two parties have engaged in updating the key provisions of that treaty. When finalised, this may have positive repercussions in the wider world."

Beyond the agreements on nuclear weapons and Afghanistan, Orttung noted that it would be hard for the U.S. and Russia to work together because of the fundamental values underlying their regimes.

He pointed out "Russia is increasingly authoritarian and relies heavily on official anti-U.S. rhetoric to boost its legitimacy. Through the election of Obama, the U.S. recently proved that change is possible through a peaceful political process. This is the kind of message that the Russian leadership does not want to hear or transmit on to the rest of the population."

Tom Collina and Greg Thielmann, both senior fellows at the Washington- based Arms Control Association told IPS "Russia can commit to President Obama's call to negotiate another treaty after New START is approved, that will cover strategic, tactical and non-deployed weapons. The greatest challenge will be Russia's reluctance to give up its tactical weapons as it would not want to reduce its nuclear arsenal any more. And it will also seek limitations on U.S. missile defences, which the U.S. will not want to provide." However, to make major strides toward nuclear abolition, it is also imperative to address the complicated issues of tactical and non-deployed nuclear warheads. The major obstacle here is the difficulty of verifying arms control limits in these categories.

For example, Russia has no intended use for the hundreds of nuclear warheads for surface-to-air missiles and many of Russia's shorter-range nuclear weapons have little utility in the post-Cold War era. Once Russia comes to recognise its large tactical nuclear arsenal as a liability in a world where the most dangerous threat is nuclear terrorism, it will be free to take unilateral initiatives and propose mutual arms control limits.

Last week, Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev called on all countries to adopt a comprehensive declaration for a nuclear-free world. "This declaration would reflect the determination of all countries to move step-by-step toward the ideals of a nuclear-free world," he said in a message to participants at a conference on International Day against Nuclear Tests.

Pavel Andreyev, RIA Novosti political commentator, observes in his comments that there is every reason to believe that a significant reduction – let alone abolition – of the Russian and U.S. nuclear arsenals would not serve as a positive example for other countries to follow. The idea of a non-nuclear world with today's unstable security conditions is a non-starter.

The Russian elite's lack of trust in the U.S. undermines the idea that Washington is ready to abandon its nuclear weapons. On the other hand, if Russia and the U.S. write off their nuclear warheads, it could provide additional impetus for the more threatening elements in the international community to further develop their own nuclear capabilities, Andreyev added.

For Russia, there is an additional stimulus to avoid a reduction of its nuclear capability. It is the long overdue military reform which would cut back on conventional forces, increasing the role of the nuclear deterrent. ■

Dangerous Nuclear Game in the Middle East

By Fareed Mahdy

ISTANBUL (IDN) - The Middle East panorama is now gloomier. The six-decade long conflict has been further aggravated by a dangerous nuclear game. Israel continues to refuse joining the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The U.S. clogs all attempts to declare the Middle East an atomic free-zone. And the Arabs accelerate their nuclear rush.

Furthermore, the ongoing U.S. imposed round of direct negotiations between Israelis and Palestinians seems to have entered a new dead end. No wonder, the forced launch of this new negotiating round appears to be rather motivated by the U.S. democratic administration's efforts to counter-balance the Republican and neo-conservative strong electoral campaign for the November's legislative partial elections. ➡



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

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



Articles

At the same time, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) failed on Sept. 24 in Vienna to persuade Israel to become a member of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and to submit its atomic facilities to the mandatory inspection. Israel is the sole Middle East atomic power.

ALLEGATIONS

The proposed resolution, promoted by Arab countries, the non-aligned nations and some Western states, has been blocked under heavy pressure from the U.S., which reportedly alleged -- oddly enough -- that such initiative may undermine the conference proposed by Egypt for 2012 to declare the Middle East free of weapons of mass destruction.

Moreover, the U.S. called for the withdrawal of the proposed resolution, warning that it sends 'negative' message to the Israeli-Palestinian peace process. For its part, Israel also strangely warned the IAEA meeting that the Arab-led efforts "to target Israel" imply a "fatal blow" to any form of cooperation for improving security in the Middle East.

The U.S. and Israeli allegations that the Arab and non-aligned states' insistence, backed by some Western countries, in demanding Israel to join the NPT, contrasts sharply with the Egypt-led position.

In fact, Cairo has systematically underscored that the non-accession by Israel to the NPT not only jeopardises security and peace in the region, but also makes them unviable.

At the end, and after a strenuous "give-and-take" negotiating exercise, 51 out of the IAEA 151 member states, voted against the resolution; 23 abstained, and 46 voted in favour of it.

In an immediate reaction to this failure, secretary general of the League of Arab States, Amre Mousa, stressed the same day from New York that the IAEA refusal to add Israel to the list of signatories to the NPT "poses many questions around the credibility" of this top UN specialised agency.

Mousa also underlined that Arab countries will continue their efforts to persuade the international community to make Israel to join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Arab states will raise their demands in this sense soon, he said.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty entered into force in 1970 and has been ratified so far by 189 countries, including Iran. By rejecting to join it, Israel also refuses to comply with the Treaty's three key pillars: non-proliferation, disarmament, and peaceful use of atomic energy.

THE BIG RUSH

Meanwhile, Turkey has joined the Middle East nuclear rush. Its parliament approved on July 13 a bill on an agreement with Russia for the construction of Turkey's first nuclear power plant in the coastal town of Akkuyu, in Mersin province. The project, worth 20 billion U.S. dollars, to finalise in four years, will be jointly operated by the two countries.

But at the same time, Turkey has also joined the Arab and non-aligned countries' chorus, by demanding a nuclear weapons free Middle East. Its president, Abdullah Gul, announced on Sept. 21 that he would call on the United Nations to achieve this objective.

"We want to see 'our' region completely free of nuclear weapons . . . this region must not be exposed to such dangerous arsenal," Gul stressed in his address to the UN General Assembly on Sept. 22. Anyway, with the new Turkish nuclear move, a total of 13 Middle East countries -- plus Israel and Iran, are already running in the accelerated atomic race.

The Arab countries involved in such race are: Algeria, Egypt, Iraq, Morocco, Kuwait, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Tunisia, and the United Arab Emirates. One of them, Kuwait, signed on Sept. 21 with Russia, a memorandum of understanding regarding nuclear cooperation. The agreement follows another that Kuwait reached only few days earlier, in addition to a previous one signed with France in April 2010. ☺



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

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



Articles

Ahmed Bishara, secretary general of the national commission for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, stated that day that the memorandum his country signed with Russia aims at "building the network of nuclear reactors and needed infrastructure in Kuwait", in addition to capacity building and training in the nuclear sector.

The Kuwaiti "network of nuclear reactors" comprises the building and operation of four of them by the year 2022.

Another one, the uranium-rich Jordan, engaged in talks with French nuclear giant Areva and Japanese firm Mitsubishi to acquire technology to enable it build its first nuclear power plant. Furthermore, Amman had announced in late July 2010 an agreement with South Korea to launch its first nuclear research reactor.

Meanwhile, France promised assistance to Qatar and Morocco to launch their own nuclear programmes, and Cairo signed last year with Moscow an agreement ensuring Russian enrolment in the setting up of nuclear plants in Egypt. And Sudan decided to join the nuclear race by announcing on August 22 a plan to build its own reactor.

OBSTACLES PERSIST

The U.S. pressures to prevent the UN Atomic Energy Agency from demanding Israel to join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and consequently to declare the Middle East a nuclear free-zone, are anything but new.

In fact, during the NPT Review conference in New York May 3-28, Washington insisted on subjecting the Arab demand for a nuclear-free region to the pre-condition that Arab countries declare peace with Israel and recognise the state of Israel, while spelling out only ambiguous words about what would the Arabs would get in exchange. On that occasion, the White House pressures prevented the adoption of the official draft that the Arab countries, led by Egypt, with strong support from Turkey and the non-aligned countries, submitted to the review conference.

According to this draft, which IDN accessed, the Arabs demanded the conference to reaffirm the relevance of the 1995 UN resolution in relation to the Middle East, which calls for declaring it a nuclear free-zone, and the need to fully implement it. Paragraph 4 of the 1995 UN resolution calls on all Middle East countries, -- with no exception -- to join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The Arab draft also calls on all countries to put all their nuclear facilities under the comprehensive guarantees agreement of the International Atomic Energy Agency;

All Middle East countries, including Iran and with the exception of Israel, have joined the NPT.

The draft stressed over and again the need to call on Israel to immediately join the NPT as a State without nuclear weapons, and to consequently accept an internationally, legally binding commitment not to possess nuclear weapons or nuclear explosive warheads, as well as accept the comprehensive guarantees agreement and its application on all its nuclear facilities and activities.

THE EGYPTIAN PLAN

One week ahead of the review conference, an Egyptian Foreign Affairs ministry launched a call on "all States to join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty". The spokesperson said in a statement on April 26, 2010 that, through its participation in the Review conference, "Egypt wants to ensure the accession of all States to this NPT".

Also on April 26, 2010 another Egyptian official source -- the Egypt State Information Service (SIS) -- disseminated an official document briefing on Cairo's position. In its introduction, it says that the "Egyptian vision for achieving peace and stability in the (Middle East) region is based on fundamentals and principles such as the fair, just solution of the Palestinian cause and the integral implementation of all resolutions based on international legitimacy".

It also stresses the principle of "respect of states' independence and sovereignty, including keeping the region far away from arms races, in particular those of mass destruction, and liberating the region from all kinds of them". ☺



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

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



Articles

50 YEARS AGO

Cairo stance in the New York conference also stressed that, since 1961, all Egyptian governments have followed a "clear and totally transparent position" vis-à-vis nuclear weapons and in general all weapons of mass destruction (atomic, biological and chemicals).

It insisted as well on its plan "to free the Middle East of these weapons, starting with nuclear arms, and that all countries in the region join all international agreements that ban the possession, proliferation, production and use of these arms, as well as all related testing".

Egypt also demanded that all Middle East countries "be submitted to all international control and inspection systems, with no exception for any state or any weapon of mass destruction, under any circumstance".

FIVE KEY POINTS

In short, the Egyptian position is based on five key points. Firstly, that the possession of weapons of mass destruction does not guarantee security to any (Middle East) country; this will be ensured only through a just, comprehensive peace. Secondly, that the lack of "any positive step" by Israel regarding the nuclear weapons issue and the Middle East liberation of arms of mass destruction, as well as its position based on the 'military superiority doctrine', will only contribute to deepening regional security imbalance;

Thirdly, that in its call for the total elimination of all kinds of weapons of mass destruction in the region, Egypt rejects any sort of discrimination or 'partialisation' that might be considered upon the will of any party in the Middle East;

Fourthly, Egypt rejects any possible 'selectiveness' of any weapon or any country, and rejects any concession of any special status to any country in the region;

And fifthly, that the process of disarming the Middle East of all kind of weapons of mass destruction must be carried out under international-comprehensive supervision, in particular by the United Nations and its agencies.

Last but not least, Egypt demands the implementation of the several UN resolutions calling for freeing the Middle East from nuclear weapons, in particular the UN Security Council resolution number 487 adopted in 1981.

NOTHING TO DO

Regarding the Iranian nuclear programme, the official spokesperson said, "The Egyptian stance is that the Iranian nuclear dossier needs to be dealt out politically, not through military actions."

"We reject the military option; we encourage Western countries concerned with this issue to act politically. We reject any military action because of the consequences it may bring to security and stability in the region."

The spokesperson also underscored that "certainly all states have the right to benefit from the advantages that the NPT offers regarding the peaceful use of nuclear power. But, at the same time, NPT member states must stick to the Treaty's provisions."

The May NPT review conference did not meet any of the above Arab and non-aligned countries' demands, backed by a number of European states, except allowing the IAEA to discuss the possibility to ask Israel to join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The International Atomic Energy Agency has failed. Israel continues to reject the international community demands. Nuclear talks with Iran are stalled. Arab countries rush rapidly into atomic. And the Israeli-Palestinian negotiations are apparently leading nowhere. (27.09.2010) ■



Articles

German Anti-Nuke Movement Withers Away

By Julio Godoy

BERLIN (IDN) – They have long disappeared from the scene, those hundreds of thousands of peace activists who call for the removal of atomic arsenal from German territory. They dominated the political landscape when NATO, the western military alliance, officially installed nuclear weapons in Germany at the height of the Cold War nearly 30 years ago. Today, those participating in peace demonstrations can be counted by the dozens.

And yet, the German activists who continue to call for nuclear disarmament are as persistent as ever. Take Elke Koller, a doctor in natural sciences and pharmacist from Leienkaul, a village in Rhineland Palatinate, the south-western federal state home of the last NATO nuclear weapons located in Germany. Among her many activities for nuclear disarmament juts a recent lawsuit she filed against the German minister of defence, Karl Theodor zu Guttenberg, for his failure in actively pursuing the removal of the nuclear weapons from the country.

Koller's court case is based on the fact that the nuclear weapons based in Germany violate several international treaties, of which the country is signatory, from the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT) to the The Treaty on the Final Settlement with Respect to Germany.

Koller says: "Our legal counsellors, members of the International Association Of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms, have found out that article 2 of the NPT prohibits Germany to host nuclear weapons, even from other countries," Koller told IDN.

Additionally, Koller said, "In our interpretation, the German constitution gives every citizen the right and the obligation to call for the government's compliance of international law."

As remarkable as Koller's lawsuit against minister Guttenberg might appear, and regardless of its chances to succeed, it has gone nearly unnoticed in Germany. This is a good indicator of the indifference with which German public now deals with the issue of nuclear disarmament.

"People do not any longer fear nuclear weapons as much as they did 30 years ago," says Jens-Peter Steffen, a member of the German office of the International physicians for the prevention of nuclear war (IPPNW) group.

"Young people in particular have no idea of the power of destruction of the nuclear bomb. They often think the nuclear bomb is just another traditional weapon, only with a bigger detonation power. They are unaware of the obliteration a nuclear bomb provokes. The issue attracts attention only on the anniversary of nuclear catastrophes, such as the destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki," Steffen told IDN, or when charismatic world leaders, such as U.S. President Barack Obama, publicly call for nuclear disarmament.

IN SEARCH OF POPULARITY

After Obama's landmark speech in Prague in April 2009, when he called the nuclear weapons spread across the world "the most dangerous legacy of the Cold War", German political leaders suddenly discovered that nuclear disarmament could be a popular issue, and joined the ranks of the peace movement.

Then foreign minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier, leader of the Social Democratic Party (SPD), urged the U.S. government and NATO (the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation) to include the nuclear weapons deployed in Germany in their disarmament plans. These nuclear weapons "are obsolete," Steinmeier rightly told the German weekly Der Spiegel at the time. Tholugh, he had seldom before pleaded against nuclear weapons.

Guido Westerwelle too, then opposition leader and now foreign minister, and so far unsuspected of anti-militarism or opposition to Western military plans, immediately called for a removal of the nuclear weapons. On May 15, 2009, six weeks afters Obama's speech in Prague, Westerwelle stressed that "the time has come for nuclear disarmament." ↻



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON- PROLIFERATION

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



Articles

As late as January 2010, Westerwelle, already serving as German foreign minister, repeated his call and claimed he was "holding negotiations with our (NATO) partners" to withdraw the nuclear weapons from Germany. "Since Obama's inauguration, there is a new dynamics on the issue," Westerwelle said.

As of today, Germany continues to be home to numerous nuclear warheads. Although the exact dimension of the nuclear arsenal deployed in Germany remains classified, IPPNW estimates that some 20 nuclear bombs of the type B61 are still stored in Buechel, a military base located in Rhine Palatinate, some 500 kilometres southwest of Berlin, near the border with Belgium and Luxembourg. Buechel has the capacity to store up to 44 nuclear warheads.

Some 1,700 German soldiers learn there the handling of this arsenal, in the framework of the so-called nuclear sharing policy, the NATO's policy of nuclear deterrence, which lets European member countries without nuclear weapons of their own participate in the planning for the use of nuclear weapons by the NATO. Other than Germany, Belgium, Italy and the Netherlands host U.S. nuclear weapons.

According to IPPNW, all in all, some 300 U.S. nuclear bombs are spread across European NATO members. Each of these bombs have a detonation power of up to 170 kilotons -- in comparison, the bomb that destroyed the Japanese city of Hiroshima in August 1945, and killed at least 200,000 people, had a detonation power of 12.5 kilotons.

The new dynamics in nuclear disarmament in the aftermath of Obama's speech in Prague was so tempting, that even the German conservative-liberal coalition formed by the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) and the Free Democratic Party (FDP), which took office in Berlin in October 2009, included the issue in its government programme.

"We strongly support the proposals made by U.S. President Obama regarding comprehensive new disarmament initiatives -- including the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons," the CDU-FDP coalition government agreement of October 2009 says.

"In this context," the agreement goes on, "as well as in the course of the drafting of a strategic concept for NATO, we will advocate within the Alliance and with our (U.S.) American allies for the removal of the remaining nuclear weapons from Germany."

THE REALITY GAP

However, the new German government's position on nuclear weapons contradicted its factual policy, which revealed that the sudden political actionism against nuclear weapons was simply driven by political opportunism and not by disarmament convictions. Until the very eve of the Oct 2009 declaration, the leading ruling party, the conservative CDU headed by Chancellor Angela Merkel, did repeatedly express it wants to hold to the bomb.

"We should be careful and avoid mixing up the goals with the ways leading to them," Merkel said in March 2009, just some days before Obama's speech in Prague. "The German government has fixed the nuclear sharing policy ... to secure our influence within NATO in this highly sensitive area."

In other words: For Merkel the nuclear weapons are indispensable, not for military reasons, but to give Germany a greater political clout within the NATO. Some months later, however, Merkel signed the call to remove the nuclear weapons from Germany.

But in the one year gone by, and as if to confirm Merkel's initial caution, the machinery of world bureaucracy has slowed down the new dynamics of nuclear disarmament. As a result, the issue has all but disappeared from the German daily public agenda.

To be sure, the not so numerous members of the peace movement, as represented by Elke Koller, continue to advocate for disarmament and for the withdrawal of the "obsolete nuclear weapons", but they do not enjoy attention from the society at large.

Only the initiated are aware that in November, NATO might discuss the removal of some or all nuclear weapons from German territory. According to analysts, "it is likely that the NATO deals with the issue. Less certain is the outcome of the debates." ➔



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

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



Articles

IPPNW's Steffen says that both the NATO and the German government want to retain the weapons in Germany, albeit not on strictly military considerations.

"The nuclear weapons stationed in Germany have no military purpose," Steffen told IDN. "They are obsolete: In case of a nuclear war, the likelihood that the NATO fights a nuclear battle within Europe is rather marginal; these weapons are useless, for you have to mount them into military airplanes and fly them over quite long distances."

Steffen said that the German government's position on nuclear disarmament is contradictory. "In public, the government claims it advocates a nuclear free world. But in reality it wants to maintain the nuclear weapons in Germany, allegedly to safeguard its influence within the NATO, and also as a bargaining material vis-à-vis Russia." Therefore, he said, the nuclear weapons stationed in Germany have "at best a political value. Militarily, they are useless."

According to foreign minister Westerwelle, "the NATO will during its next summit in (the Portuguese capital) Lisbon approve its new strategy, which will deal with the question of what role are nuclear weapons supposed to play in the defence and security policies of the alliance under the present geopolitical circumstances."

In an interview, Westerwelle claimed that during the NATO meeting of foreign and defence ministers in April 2010 in Tallinn, Estonia, he had initiated a debate on the meaning of nuclear weapons in the present-day world -- as if Obama's speech in Prague and subsequent measures have never happened.

But Westerwelle admitted that the U.S. has already downgraded, at least in its rhetoric, the importance of the bomb in its own military policy. "In this context," he said, "it is the German government's objective that the nuclear weapons stationed in our territory be removed, in agreement with our (NATO) military partners."

But for Steffen, and despite the nuclear weapons' evident military uselessness, the likelihood that the NATO decides to remove them from Germany is all but marginal.

OBSOLETE BUT . . .

Most likely then, the nuclear weapons will remain stationed in Germany, even though also the U.S. military admits that they are obsolete. In December 2008, in a report for the U.S. defence ministry, a U.S. expert commission concluded that the B61 nuclear bombs deployed across Europe are "useless, military speaking".

The commission also underlined the disproportionate costs associated with maintaining this nuclear arsenal ready for use.

In addition, Germany does not have sovereign access to them. In the framework of its "nuclear sharing" strategy, the NATO has deployed nuclear weapons in its European member countries officially known as non nuclear powers, such as Germany. But these nuclear weapons are managed and secured by U.S. soldiers; the codes required for their detonation are also under the control of the U.S. military.

Despite such violations of the German sovereignty, the nuclear weapons do not longer constitute a popular theme among German political leaders or civil society at large. It is quite telling that the one senior official who talks the least about the issue is the minister of defence, Karl-Theodor Guttenberg. It is his indifference that led Elke Koller to sue him on behalf of the German government for violating international treaties.

But also among opposition leaders the theme has long lost attraction. While during the months that followed Obama's speech in April 2009, practically the leaders of all parties were scrambling to discuss the issue publicly, now they leave it to their youth organisations and other low-ranking groups.

This is the case of the SPD. While former foreign minister Steinmeier has lost interest in the issue, the party's youth officials, known as Jusos (for Jung Sozialisten, Young Socialists) have inherited the task of demonstrating for nuclear disarmament. ➡



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION
People's Decade for Nuclear Abolition
Act to make "No more nukes"



Articles

In a recent statement, the Juso leader Franziska Drohsel complained: "20 years after the end of the Cold War, nuclear weapons are still deployed in Germany. Every one of these bombs has the destructive potential of several of the bombs" that wiped out the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Drohsel recalled that the NATO leadership puts countries such as Pakistan and North Korea "to the pillories" for their nuclear weapons, while holding to its own nuclear arsenal. "We cannot plea convincingly for other countries' nuclear disarmament while we keep our arsenal," Drohsel said.

ELECTRONIC CAMPAIGN

Yet another symbolic campaign for the removal of the nuclear weapons from Germany is an electronic mail action addressed to the minister of defence Guttenberg. In a letter, signed and sent per e-mail by hundreds of activists to Guttenberg's headquarters, the peace activists urge the minister during NATO's November summit at Lisbon to "strongly argue (before the military alliance) in favour of the removal of the nuclear weapons still deployed in Germany."

In the letter, the peace activists remind Guttenberg that on March 24, 2010 the vast majority of the Bundestag, the lower house of the German parliament, approved a motion calling for the removal of the weapons from the country's territory.

It remains to be seen what response these campaigns, including the law suit against minister Guttenberg, might receive. Most likely, none at all. Given the general indifference towards the issue, even if the NATO takes the unlikely decision to remove all nuclear weapons from German territory, the measure might as well go unnoticed. (17.09.2010) ■



Translations | Adaptations

Eastern Europe: Unwilling to Back Full Nuclear Disarmament

Arabic

<http://www.ipsinternational.org/arabic/nota.asp?idnews=1985>

Japanese

http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=269:2010-10-13-03-28-33&catid=2:japanese&Itemid=3

http://www.nuclearabolition.net/documents/Japanese/Japanese_Eastern_Europe_Unwilling_to_Back_Full_Nuclear_Disarmament.pdf

Russia: New START May End With a Whimper

Japanese

http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=270:start&catid=2:japanese&Itemid=3

http://www.nuclearabolition.net/documents/Japanese/Japanese_RUSSIA_New_START_May_End_With_a_Whimper.pdf

Spanish

http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=259:desarme-nuclear-todavia-lejos&catid=10:spanish&Itemid=11

German Anti-Nuke Movement Withers Away

Japanese

http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=264:2010-10-07-02-51-34&catid=2:japanese&Itemid=3

http://www.nuclearabolition.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=265:-pdf&catid=2:japanese&Itemid=3 ■



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

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



Civil Society's Perspective

Tony Waterston: ICAN, you can, we can: banning the bomb in Basel

7 Sep, 10 | by BMJ Group



Being a member of a Nobel peace prize-winning organisation confers pride but not necessarily a sense of direction. Both were overwhelmingly present at the 19th Congress of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War in Basel, which was attended by a record number of doctors and medical students from North and South America, Europe, the Middle and Far East, and Australasia.

Pride comes from the remarkable history of IPPNW which gained the peace prize only 5 years after its founding by an American and Russian cardiologist in 1980, at the height of the cold war.

President Gorbachev in his memoirs paid tribute to the influence of IPPNW on his policies for nuclear weapons reduction. Since then, the movement has brought together Indian and Pakistani doctors, Chinese and Russians, and Israelis and Palestinians, all with an anti-nuclear agenda.

Is the IPPNW still relevant in the 21st century, when we are surrounded by non-nuclear health threats such as climate change, the north south divide, and the tobacco epidemic? I think it definitely is. First, because nuclear weapons could end the world as we know it at any time, and yet are no defence: as one speaker put it well, "security is primarily a matter of relationships." And second, IPPNW is relevant because it unites doctors in tackling the causes of conflict – and this includes both small arms (the objective of the African affiliates) and misunderstanding and prejudice (the objective of the middle east affiliates).

At the Basel meeting, a sense of direction came from the Middle East affiliates and from ICAN. At the workshop on a middle east nuclear free zone there were doctors and students from Egypt, Israel, the occupied Palestinian territories, Iraq, and Iran, together with the US and many European countries. The Iranian affiliate members were wholly constructive whilst arguing that threats directed at their country would be less effective than incentives, and pointing out that there is a significant anti-nuclear movement in Iran.

The Palestinian and Israeli affiliates will work together on a proposal to heighten public awareness in the region on the medical effects of a conflict between Israel and Iran - as this is little understood by the general public in Israel. Work will also continue on developing a nuclear free zone in the region and an IPPNW delegation will visit governments to argue the case.

And ICAN? This major project of IPPNW is the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons. Utopian? Maybe –but so was the campaign to end the slave trade, and do we not have an equally good case? As a result of IPPNW lobbying, the UN secretary general has thrown his weight behind the setting up of a Nuclear Weapons convention (the main aim of ICAN) and the final document of the recent NPT review committee also called for the same. Perhaps not so utopian.

What will I remember most from the Congress? I think the interfaith service in the Predigerkirche in Basel which was attended by a large number of the doctors from many different countries. The service included readings from Jewish, Muslim, Christian, Bahai, Hindu and Alevitic texts chosen to represent complementary philosophies. Music also played a large part in this hugely moving service, which finished with an improvisation on the church's three organs based on the recited texts from the service.

Tony Waterston is a paediatrician in Newcastle-upon-Tyne, working mainly in the community with long term conditions, disability, child abuse and social and mental health concerns. His interests are in child public health, children's rights and global child health and he leads the RCPCH teaching programme in the occupied Palestinian territories.

(Source: <http://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2010/09/07/tony-waterston-ican-you-can-we-can-banning-the-bomb-in-basel/>) ■



Civil Society's Perspective

Music icon John Butler joins abolition movement

News story, 30 September 2010: Australian music icon John Butler has joined the global campaign for a treaty to outlaw nuclear weapons. In a short video made in September this year, John calls on people to upload their own message on the [Million Pleas website](#) and make the world a safer and more peaceful place.

In the video, John says, "Million Pleas is asking everybody around this beautiful fine planet of ours to call on their governments to sign a treaty banning the use of nuclear weapons."

See the video on the new ICAN Australia website here: John Butler appeal <http://icanw.org.au/node/123>

Million Pleas is an initiative of the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) and was launched in August this year to commemorate the 65th anniversary of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan.

The website features schoolchildren from Hiroshima pleading with world leaders to get on with the job of abolishing nuclear weapons once and for all.

ICAN calls on other musicians to support this simple and creative initiative, make their own video of support and forward onto their support base to encourage them to do the same.

Go to millionpleas.com and enter your plea through Facebook, Twitter or make a YouTube video and add your voice to the worlds longest video chain letter!! (Source: ICAN) ■

"Freeing Our World From Nuclear Weapons"

Physicians Against Nuclear War Conference, Japan, September 19 2010

Speech given by ICAN Chair Associate Professor Tilman Ruff | Extracts

. . . Over the past 4 years since Helsinki, through the work of many, there have been important achievements through ICAN.

1. The model Nuclear Weapons Convention was updated, re-published and promoted. It is widely regarded as the most thoughtful and detailed effort to define all the key elements of the legal agreements needed to achieve and sustain a world freed from nuclear weapons and how they might fit together. It is not a take it or leave it package deal.

The legal architecture that will eventually outlaw and eliminate nuclear weapons may look quite different. However it is a serious effort to apply the lessons of successful disarmament treaties like START, the INF Treaty, and the Chemical Weapons Convention to define and link in a comprehensive treaty the requirements to achieve and sustain a world free of nuclear weapons. It provides a checklist. A comprehensive treaty has been the way real progress has been made on all other inhumane and indiscriminate weapons. It applies the same approach to nuclear weapons. It clearly demonstrates that abolition is achievable. Do not tell me this cannot be done – here is how it could be done. The model NWC is strongly promoted by UN Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon as a good point of departure for states to fulfil their nuclear disarmament obligation.

(Source: http://www.icanw.org/files/Nara_PANW%20TAR%2019.9.10.pdf) ■



Civil Society's Perspective

Ed Miliband speech welcomed by CND

28 September 2010

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament welcomed Ed Miliband's speech to Labour Party conference as evidence that the Party was "now making a decisive move away from the aggressive pro-war policies of New Labour". Kate Hudson, General Secretary of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, said: "Ed Miliband's speech shows that at long last the Party is making a decisive move away from the aggressive pro-war policies pursued by New Labour. Many have been waiting years to hear a Labour leader tell the public the party was 'wrong to take Britain to war and we need to be honest about that'. His condemnation of Israel's cruel and counterproductive blockade of Gaza and pledge to 'strain every sinew to work to [lift it]' suggests he is not just reflecting on the mistakes of the past but willing to take forward a policy which truly does reflect a rejection of Blair's subservience to the US.

"We welcome what seem to be signs of a new foreign policy vision in Ed Miliband's thinking. He twice reiterated the need for 'our values, not just alliances' to shape Britain's foreign policy. His optimism and his determination to take Britain forward are positive signs that he is willing to challenge 'conventional wisdom'. In his election campaign he stated his view that Trident should be included in the Strategic Defence Review - that it should be reconsidered in the new context in which we find ourselves. We hope that Ed will now press forward with that. "Part of the 'old thinking' that Ed wishes to break from is that 'the challenges of the world were too big and our country too small to make a difference'. The option to cancel Trident is one clear area where Britain can give a lead and make a real difference to global moves towards nuclear disarmament and Obama's vision of global abolition." ■

MPs' criticism of half-baked Defence Review welcomed by CND

15 September 2010

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament today welcomed the report into the Strategic Defence and Security Review produced by the House of Commons Defence Committee, which slams the "startling rapidity" of the process and the lack of consultation undertaken by the MoD. The MPs criticise Ministers' decision to formally exclude Trident from the review when "in practice, this decision [that the MoD must pay for Trident replacement from its own budget] seems to put the issue of Trident renewal into the SDSR without making this explicit, which unhelpfully reduces the transparency of the process."

Kate Hudson, General Secretary of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, said "The Defence Committee rightly criticise the bizarre decision to exclude Trident from the Review. It is a nonsense to undertake a once-a-decade 'strategic' review but to exclude the single most expensive programme - Trident replacement - from it. In reality, the Treasury decision that Trident should be paid for out of the MoD main budget means everything in the SDSR is dependent on the Trident decision. Billions spent on a new generation of nuclear weapons are billions made unavailable for front-line units, aircraft carriers or cyber-security.

"Were the Trident replacement programme to suffer from anything like the 48% overspend experienced by the current Astute submarine programme, whole swathes of defence activity would have to be cut to pay for it. Not to even include consideration of a project that bring with it these risks is totally irresponsible.

"We welcome the MPs acknowledgment of the 'general public opposition to the war in Iraq, and questionable support amongst the electorate for current operations in Afghanistan'. People have for too long felt ignored when it comes to Defence. We are told British forces are fighting 'for democracy' yet the public have no way of feeding in to the decisions being taken with our cash. As Nick Clegg said only last month 'It is going to be difficult for someone who is going to receive less housing benefit because of the changes we are introducing to understand why at the same time we should spend huge, huge sums of money in a hurry on replacing Trident in full.' We couldn't agree more. This half-baked defence review could have offered a chance for the Coalition to engage the millions of people who feel let down by the foreign wars that have been launched in their name. Sadly, it seems the deafness of the MoD continues." Yesterday, CND launched a new report which shows the net impact of replacing the Trident nuclear weapons system will be to cause an overall reduction in defence employment, due to the need to scrap more labour-intensive conventional defence activities to pay for Trident. For more on this see

<http://www.cnduk.org/index.php/20100913937/press-releases/trident/trident-will-cause-defence-job-losses-new-report.html> ■



What Others Say

The Huffington Post | September 2, 2010

Why Muslims Should Support Nuclear Weapons Disarmament

By Rizwan Ladha

MA Candidate in Nuclear Security, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy

Sadly, though the current fixation of national debate is still the "Ground Zero Mosque," public opinion polls indicate that American sentiment towards the bomb has become ambivalent, and most recently, dangerously lukewarm -- something I discussed in my piece last week.

But the issue can be refocused in a spiritual light and bring to the ongoing debate on nuclear weapons an angle and voice that were notably absent for the duration of the Cold War.

An excellent interview was published September 1st in the *U.S. News & World Report* with the Rev. Tyler Wigg-Stevenson, an evangelical Christian and founder of the Two Futures Project.

According to the website, the Project is:

... a movement of American Christians for the abolition of all nuclear weapons ... We support concrete and practical steps to reduce nuclear dangers immediately, while pursuing the multilateral, global, irreversible, and verifiable elimination of nuclear weapons, as a biblically-grounded mandate and as a contemporary security imperative ... By joining together with one voice of Christian conscience, we seek to encourage and enable our national leaders to make the complete elimination of nuclear weapons the organizing principle of American nuclear weapons policy. **We join in this work to the glory of God.** [emphasis added]

I think this is not only absolutely fascinating, it is absolutely necessary. The strategy of the Two Futures Project -- to re-establish a 45-year-long debate on nuclear weapons, historically devoid of religion and faith-based morality altogether, in a contemporary understanding of what it means to be a loving, caring, responsible Christian -- is to be commended. In his interview with *U.S. News*, the Reverend lays it out very neatly:

From my point of view, there's no legitimate theological basis in the Bible for Christians to justify the killing of innocents. Nuclear weapons also violate the "just war" criteria, for instance. They don't discriminate between innocents and non-innocents, and they are disproportionate. With that theological conviction, there are only two futures: a world in which nuclear weapons are used, and one in which they are abolished. For me, the choice is easy.

For moderate and intellectual Muslims as well, the choice should be simple: either risk annihilating the human race or eliminate the global threat posed by nuclear weapons. Believe it or not -- and I know I'm opening up a big hole here -- there is plenty of talk in the Qur'an about being good, kind, righteous, giving and generous to one's fellow man, regardless of religious creed. Please note that while the following translations come from Abdullah Yusuf Ali, a renowned Qur'anic scholar, the interpretations thereof are completely mine. A few examples:

O mankind! We created you from a single (pair) of a male and a female, and made you into nations and tribes, that ye may know each other (not that ye may despise (each other)). Verily the most honoured of you in the sight of Allah is (he who is) the most righteous of you. And Allah has full knowledge and is well acquainted (with all things). --Qur'an 49:13

Here's another one, one of my favorite passages, that discusses what righteousness really is:

It is not righteousness that ye turn your faces towards east or West; but it is righteousness- to believe in Allah and the Last Day, and the Angels, and the Book, and the Messengers; to spend of your substance, out of love for Him, for your kin, for orphans, for the needy, for the wayfarer, for those who ask, and for the ransom of slaves; to be steadfast in prayer, and practice regular charity; to fulfill the contracts which ye have made; and to be firm and patient, in pain (or suffering) and adversity, and throughout all periods of panic. Such are the people of truth, the Allah-fearing. --Qur'an 2:177 ☺



What Others Say

And finally, a passage that gives credibility to my argument that moderate Muslims should have no problem with, and in fact should support, the Two Futures Project:

Those who believe (in the Qur'an), and those who follow the Jewish (scriptures), and the Christians and the Sabians,- any who believe in Allah and the Last Day, and work righteousness, shall have their reward with their Lord; on them shall be no fear, nor shall they grieve. --Qur'an 2:62

Hence, and in light of these verses, it is my (admittedly simplistic) conclusion that when it comes to threats to humanity, there should be a Muslim voice to join hands with that of Christians who support the Two Futures Project -- a voice that is grounded in the realities of our time, that is forward-looking and hopeful, that understands Islam to be a faith of peace and an integral part of the Abrahamic tradition and experience, and that advocates for the salvation and dignity of all human life, irrespective of belief or creed.

And that would truly be joining in this work to the glory of God. ■

The Daily Caller | September 3, 2010

Time to act on nuclear test ban

By Ambassador Tibor Toth

Despite the worst, the human mind tends to assume the best. Twenty-one years ago, as fragments of the Berlin Wall were being seized by souvenir hunters, a collective sigh of relief went up and the specter of nuclear Armageddon suddenly dimmed.

In 2010, we need no reminder that the end of the Cold War, unfortunately, did not bring with it the end of the nuclear threat. Twenty thousand nuclear weapons remain in the world's arsenals. Eliminating those weapons is an imperative that must be urgently met.

As long as so many nuclear weapons remain in so many hands, we can't ignore the risk of them falling into the possession of terrorists. Closing the door on the development of nuclear weapons, once and for all, is a critical step towards their elimination.

In New York this May, at the five-yearly Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference, nearly 190 states committed to a world free of nuclear weapons. Their commitments build on a worldwide groundswell of opposition to nuclear weapons.

But such concern needs to be turned into concrete action. This is not a quixotic venture and naysayers who contend that nuclear disarmament is an illusion that cannot be fulfilled fly in the face of history.

The nuclear arms race began on August 29th, 1949, when the Soviet Union detonated its first nuclear device, "First Lightning," at the Semipalatinsk test range in Kazakhstan. The detonation came four years after the United States exploded the world's first nuclear bomb at a test range in New Mexico.

In 1991, after the exploding of over 450 nuclear bombs, Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev shut down the Semipalatinsk site. Kazakhstan eventually rejected its entire nuclear arsenal, which was the world's fourth largest. A decade and a half later, Kazakhstan's nuclear inheritance from the breakup of the Soviet Union is a part of history.

Fourteen-hundred nuclear warheads, intercontinental ballistic missiles, cruise missiles and heavy bombers were returned to Russia for disposal under the START 1 Treaty. Weapons-grade uranium was down blended into commercial reactor fuel and weaponizable plutonium was safely disposed of. Reactors that had provided weapons material were de-commissioned. The Semipalatinsk test site was spiked. Once one of the world's most nuclear-armed nations, Kazakhstan acceded to the NPT in 1994 as a non-nuclear weapons state. In 1996, four days after the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) opened for signature, it was signed by Kazakhstan.



What Others Say

Without being able to test nuclear weapons, a state seeking to develop them will have its hands tied. Now is the time for the nine states — including the U.S. and China — whose ratification of the CTBT will bring it into force to show the political will to fully endorse it.

The U.S. has an historic opportunity to lead by example and ratify the CTBT by next August 29th to lend this anniversary the significance it deserves.

The desire to pursue a nuclear-weapon-free world is not in short measure, but we need to continue to observe August 29th as a reminder to act and not wait.

Ending nuclear explosions is a goal on the road to nuclear disarmament that must be reached.

Kazakhstan offers a clear example for the rest of the world of how nuclear disarmament can be undertaken. Kazakhstan's example shows that states can abdicate their nuclear regalia without it impinging on their security. Belarus, South Africa and Ukraine have also renounced their nuclear arsenals, thus setting the same example.

The echo of Semipalatinsk should be heard every August 29th until nuclear explosions stop — once and for all.
Ambassador Tibor Toth is the Executive Secretary of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO).

The Middle East Media Research Institute

Possible Acceleration of Arab World's Nuclearization as a Result of President Obama's Global Nuclear Disarmament Policy

By: A. Savyon*

Introduction

The past few months have seen some highly significant developments in U.S. nuclear policy, and in this policy's ramifications for the Middle East. This paper will examine these developments.

The Pendulum of the Obama Administration's Nuclear Policy

Upon taking office in 2009, U.S. President Barack Obama announced his intention to promote his vision of global nuclear disarmament. On April 5, 2009 in Prague, he presented an ambitious strategy for achieving this goal, based on three major components: 1) Taking concrete steps towards a world without nuclear weapons by reducing existing nuclear arsenals; 2) Strengthening the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and keeping new countries from acquiring nuclear weapons; 3) Ensuring that terrorists never acquire a nuclear weapon. To achieve the last, President Obama announced a new international effort to secure all vulnerable nuclear material around the world within four years.

As a further step towards the realization of these goals, on April 12, 2010 President Obama convened the Nuclear Security Summit in Washington, DC, with the participation of most of the leaders of the free world.

One month later, in May, the 2010 *Review Conference* of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) was convened in New York. In light of President Obama's desire to harness this conference to his own vision, and to make sure that it would be a success — i.e. that it would produce resolutions passed by consensus — his administration was forced into agreeing to the condition, set by the Arab countries and led by Egypt, for international pressure on Israel and for Israel's isolation in the international nuclear community in exchange for such consensual resolutions. Capitulating to the Arab-Egyptian pressure, the Obama administration ultimately decided not to use its power of veto, but to vote for the concluding resolution calling on Israel to accede to the NPT and to place all its nuclear facilities under comprehensive IAEA safeguards. ➡



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

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



What Others Say

President Obama himself welcomed the resolution, saying that it "includes balanced and practical steps that will advance non-proliferation, nuclear disarmament, and peaceful uses of nuclear energy, which are critical pillars of the global non-proliferation regime."

By voting for the resolution, the U.S. abandoned its traditional stance supporting Israel's position that a nuclear weapons-free zone in the Middle East is possible and in fact essential, but must include not only nuclear weapons but all types of non-conventional weapons – such as chemical and biological weapons in the possession of Israel's neighbors – and, moreover, that this goal can be realized only after the attaining of comprehensive peace agreements in the region.

The Obama administration's acquiescence to Arab pressure, and its deviation from long-standing U.S. policy, was perceived by Israel as a threat to its security, and Israel demanded that the situation be rectified. The administration complied; as soon as the conference's concluding resolution passed, administration officials hastened to issue statements aimed at softening the impact of the U.S.'s vote on Israel-U.S. relations. For example, in a May 28 statement, President Obama's national security advisor Gen. James Jones said that the U.S. deplored the decision to single out Israel in the NPT document's Middle East section, and that the U.S. remained committed to Israel's security.

A more significant backtrack came during Israel Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's visit to Washington on July 6. The Israeli daily *Haaretz* reported that in talks since the conference, the Americans clarified that the decision had been a "mistake," and that "in an effort to clarify the administration's stance on the Israeli nuclear question, it was determined that – in coordination with Israel – the full details of the high-level understandings [on Israel's status of nuclear ambiguity] between the two sides, reached during the 1960s, would finally be revealed."^[6] The White House released a special press announcement stating: "President [Obama] told Prime Minister [Netanyahu] he recognizes that Israel must always have the ability to defend itself, by itself, against any threat or possible combination of threats, and that only Israel can determine its security needs."

With this public proclamation, the Obama pendulum swung back to long-standing U.S. policy. However, in the circumstances in which the statement was made – that is, to rectify the U.S.'s vote for the NPT Review conference resolution isolating Israel – Obama's declaration constitutes a public and explicit confirmation of Israel's special nuclear status. The statement expresses the U.S.'s guarantee of Israel's existence and security, and its preservation of Israel's preferred nuclear status in the Middle East. President Obama went even farther, also recognizing Israel's right to deterrence – that is, that Israel is entitled to possess its own strategic deterrent capability. Thus, this statement by President Obama ushered in the end of the era of Israel's nuclear ambiguity.

Consequently, the White House statements following the Netanyahu meeting, i.e. that the U.S. would not touch Israel's policy of nuclear ambiguity, mean nothing, because President Obama had already recognized Israel's nuclear status and its right to maintain it.

Conclusions and Ramifications

The actions in recent months by the Obama administration in nuclear affairs, aimed at advancing a vision and a policy of global nuclear disarmament, have had the exact opposite effect. In his efforts to advance global nuclear disarmament, Obama brought to the fore what the U.S. had for four decades managed to downplay and marginalize – U.S. recognition of and partnership with Israel's policy of nuclear ambiguity. By openly acknowledging what his eight presidential predecessors had recognized implicitly – i.e. that Israel needs nuclear capability to defend its very existence – President Obama has put an end to Israel's status of nuclear ambiguity.

This development could lead to stepped-up demands for nuclearization by leading Arab states that feel threatened by both Israel and by Iran – and could result in accelerated moves in that direction.

**A. Savyon is Director of the Iranian Media Project.*



What Others Say

Common Dreams.org

Nuclear Missile Testing Continues in California

SANTA BARBARA, Calif. - September 13 - The US military has announced a test of a Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile from Vandenberg Air Force Base on September 15. The Minuteman missile will carry a "dummy" nuclear warhead from Vandenberg to the Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands. The test is scheduled less than three weeks after the official UN International Day against Nuclear Tests (August 29).

David Krieger, President of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, said, "The US moratorium on nuclear testing remains incomplete as long as we continue testing missiles designed to carry nuclear warheads. Minuteman III missiles are used solely to deliver nuclear warheads."

The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation seeks the abolition of all nuclear weapons worldwide. The Foundation calls on the United States and all countries around the world to recognize their full obligation to halt all nuclear testing - not only of the warheads, but also of nuclear-capable missiles. The Preamble to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) calls upon the 189 countries that signed the NPT to facilitate "the elimination from national arsenals of nuclear weapons and the means of their delivery."

Dr. Krieger added, "The US is demonstrating a stark double standard by condemning missile tests of other nations while continuing to conduct them on a regular basis itself. Continued testing of Minuteman III missiles by the United States sends a provocative message and encourages other countries to pursue their own nuclear weapon and missile delivery programs." ■

IAEA | 13 September 2010

IAEA Director General Yukiya Amano today opened a busy Board of Governors meeting.

During the opening, he reported on nuclear security, nuclear verification, safeguards, assurance of fuel supply and budget-related issues.

Mr. Amano also reiterated his personal commitment to redouble efforts to help bring about a world free of nuclear weapons. "I intend to focus strongly on this goal... under the guidance of the Board of Governors."

Nuclear Security Report 2010

"Adherence to the relevant international legal instruments on nuclear security has gradually increased. However, I must point out that, while it is five years since the adoption of the *Amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material*, progress towards entry into force remains slow. The Secretariat plans to hold a meeting in November to identify ways in which assistance can be given to States that wish to adhere to the Amendment."

Nuclear Verification

Democratic People's Republic of Korea

"As the Agency has had no inspectors in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea since April last year, I have nothing to report to the Board on any activities of the IAEA in relation to that country. The DPRK has not permitted the Agency to implement safeguards in the country since December 2002 and it has not implemented the relevant measures called for in Security Council resolutions 1718 and 1874. I urge the DPRK to fully implement all relevant nuclear non-proliferation obligations. I again call on all parties concerned to make concerted efforts for a resumption of the Six-Party Talks at an appropriate time, with the ultimate aim of the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula." ↻



What Others Say

Islamic Republic of Iran

"You have before you my report on *Implementation of the NPT Safeguards Agreement and Relevant Provisions of Security Council Resolutions in the Islamic Republic of Iran*. I learned with great regret about Iran's decision to object to the designation of two inspectors who recently conducted inspections in Iran. I express my full confidence in the professionalism and impartiality of the inspectors concerned. As noted in my report, Iran's repeated objection to the designation of inspectors with experience in Iran's nuclear fuel cycle and facilities hampers the inspection process. I call upon Iran once again to reconsider its decision of 16 January 2007 to request the Agency to withdraw the designation of 38 inspectors."

Syrian Arab Republic

"As my report on *Implementation of the NPT Safeguards Agreement in the Syrian Arab Republic* shows, Syria has declined to engage substantively with the Agency in connection with the unresolved issues related to the Dair Alzour site and some other locations. As a consequence, the Agency has not been able to make progress towards resolving the outstanding issues related to those sites. It is critical that Syria positively engage with the Agency on all of these issues without further delay."

Safeguards in the Middle East

"There continues to be a general lack of clarity among Member States in the region on the substance and modalities of an agreement to establish a Middle East nuclear-weapon-free zone. I will continue my consultations with concerned Member States. The *NPT Review Conference* in May endorsed the convening of a conference in 2012, to be attended by all States of the Middle East, on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction in that region. I was very pleased that the *2010 Review Conference* produced some concrete results. I hope that the proposed 2012 conference will take place with the participation of all relevant States and that it will lead to a productive outcome."

Israeli Nuclear Capabilities

"In August I visited Israel where, at the highest political level, I conveyed the *General Conference's* concern about the Israeli nuclear capabilities and invited Israel to consider acceding to the NPT and placing all its nuclear facilities under comprehensive IAEA safeguards."

Tehran Research Reactor

"Regarding Iran's request to the Agency to facilitate the supply of nuclear fuel for the Tehran Research Reactor, I have continued to consult with all concerned parties. In late July, I conveyed to all interested parties my readiness to host a meeting to facilitate the process. I stand ready to convene such a meeting, subject to the agreement of all concerned parties."

Scientific Forum

"We have been able to secure the participation of top cancer specialists, scientists and experts from all over the world for next week's *Scientific Forum*, which is devoted to cancer in the developing world. This promises to be an exciting and informative event and I hope as many Member States as possible will participate." -- *By Sasha Henriques, IAEA Division of Public Information.*

The Market Oracle | September 14, 2010

Nuclear Renaissance or The End of Nations ?

By: Andrew McKillop

The Internet is a vast rumour mill and Internet-thinking can lead to paranoia and selfdelusion. This has infected the so-called "Nuclear debate" just like the Climate debate, the Peak oil debate, the Environment debate and other mix-and-muddle mass readership themes generated by political and corporate elites, put through the rumour mill, and sterilized. Due to this, the real dimensions of the nuclear challenge - extending right up to removing all remaining credibility from the notion of "the nation state" - has been sidelined and lost in a maze of lesser conspiracy theories, like the long-running or nearly endless saga of the Iran nuclear affair. To tweak up the hysteria level every few months, we have Bomb Iran calls, tacky histrionics and tinsel debate, but the threat of nation states simply being no longer defensible because of current civil nuclear proliferation and the massive plans and programs to build new civil reactors, almost everywhere, never gets airtime. ☺



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

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



What Others Say

Impassioned calls for Iran bombing are presented as the quick fix solution to nuclear weapons proliferation. In Iran's case, this would be a Doomsday Choice spilling long-lived radiation poisoning around the Gulf region, and further. It would also be a Doomsday Choice in any other country with large size reactors and extensive nuclear waste stores, uranium fuel fabricating plants and other parts of "the fuel cycle", that got bombed - for any reason at all.

Chernobyl 1986 is a key nuclear weapons proliferation date. It is at least as real as the Manhattan Project and the bombing of Hiroshima in 1945 or Dr Abdul Qadr "Bombs R Us" Khan's two screwdriver turn A-bomb on which he started work in 1975, and the US led coalition's massive use of Depleted Uranium weapons in the Liberation of Kuwait, 1991.

To be sure, president Obama calls for nuclear disarmament and faster decommissioning of Russian and US atom bombs but the hidden agenda, here, is the massive undersupply of uranium for the world's reactor fleet. Decommissioning bombs releases atomic materials to feed US civil nuclear reactors - which supposedly received about 45% of their total fuel need from the "Megatons to Megawatts" source in 2009.

Taking bombs apart to get reactor fuel has a best-by date simply due to these sources of reactor fuel being limited. When or if we ran out of bombs to take apart it will be even more necessary to play with plutonium-generating Fast Breeder Reactors as a possible way out of the uranium fuel supply garrot.

NUCLEAR RENAISSANCE

The 2010-2020 decade marks the world's "Nuclear Renaissance" according to triumphal industry spokesmen. It may result in the construction of 200 - 250 new reactors, mostly in the Emerging countries. The countries signing up to the New Nuclear Miracle, which extends to its debt-linked financing, now range far and wide in the low and mid income South. They include Bangladesh, Indonesia, Philippines, Vietnam, Kazakhstan, Mongolia, Sudan, Nigeria, Ghana, Algeria, Egypt, Jordan and plenty others.

Plutonium production and proliferation risks can only rise. More than 75 of these Chernobyl-sized reactors would be built in 15 to 18, or more, low and mid-income countries with absolutely no previous experience of the atom. Many of them are exposed to civil war uprisings, are riven with religious and community conflicts, experience periodic food shortages, have water supply and power infrastructure breakdowns and blackouts, and have very troubled relations with their neighbours.

These countries, exactly like China and India, are however committing themselves to the same gleaming high-tech Quick Fix nuclear solution to power shortages, to keep their economies growing at record rates. This will vastly extend the Doomsday threat of large reactors being treated as sitting duck military targets in regional conflicts. This is over and apart from the risk of worst possible reactor accidents, such as the 1986 Chernobyl disaster, and over and apart from nuclear waste and fuel enrichment security and pollution threats generated by surging reactor numbers.

Nuclear power is sold using a Cornucopian Universal Prosperity and Titanic Power Myth, but our main concern is simple: What happens when nuclear weapons proliferation includes massive Dirty Bomb targets and the massive potential of simply and cheaply turning nuclear wastes into deadly carcinogenic Depleted Uranium weapons? To be sure, the nuclear sales lobby claims nuclear energy faces no shortage of uranium, is cheap and clean (low CO2), cuts oil dependence nearly to zero, improves energy security despite all or most of the uranium being imported, is high-tech, prestigious and modern. Above all, weapons proliferation is no risk - we have the NPT! Even the risk of 'recycling' nuclear wastes to make the Poor Man's nuclear ordnance - Depleted Uranium weapons - is low or zero.

Like Obama, Sarkozy, Merkel and other leaders of the reactor building, uranium supplier, and nuclear service selling countries, the Nuclear Lobby claims nuclear power is totally separate and separable from weapons. It claims it is the quickest possible, most market friendly, and cheapest Fast Track to generating more power.

Reality dashes all of these illusions and self delusions. It reveals the risks, the hazards, the long-term costs, and the fragile "market friendly" reactor financing set-ups used by the so-called financial community to sell the atom to countries ranging from Bangladesh to Sudan and harnessing them with 50-year debts for their choice of hi-tech atomic trinkets. ➡



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

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



What Others Say

Each new large-sized civil reactor is potentially a Chernobyl-type Dirty Bomb and each year will generate enough plutonium (about 50 kilograms) to make 5 Hiroshima-type and sized bombs, or 10 atom bombs of the same power using modern technology weapon design. Bomb technology dates back 65 years, has seriously evolved in 65 years, and is now almost ubiquitously available. Large sized reactors can also provide massive quantities of nuclear waste for cheaply produced and deadly carcinogenic Depleted Uranium weapons, recycling and value-adding to nuclear wastes, rather than face ever rising long term disposal costs for these unwanted side-products of the "nuclear miracle".

Nuclear reactors are massive Dirty Bomb targets. Reactor materials can be used to make atomic weapons. Nuclear waste can be quickly and cheaply used to make deadly carcinogenic Depleted Uranium weapons. The world's plutonium repositories, which contain hundreds of tons of plutonium extracted from civil reactors, are literal Doomsday Weapons.

THE END OF THE NATION STATE

Due to this sombre context, national security as we know it and with any real meaning no longer exists. Any country with large sized nuclear reactors is not defensible. Its has already positioned Weapons of Mass Destruction - for the enemy side - inside its national territory. When both belligerent nations have nuclear reactors, they have guaranteed and massive Mutually Assured Destruction.

When we take account of the full risks of the coming worldwide nuclear boom, the exploding number of civil reactor numbers, the full extent of fuel production and reprocessing, accumulated nuclear wastes, plutonium production and storage, and the spiralling amounts of 'new' nuclear waste being produced each day, the nation state itself has no remaining signification or meaning. Its civil nuclear reactors are the "softest" and easiest targets for conventional military attack - with guaranteed devastating sequels.

The nation state's "prerogative" of making war, for example in Afghanistan and Iraq is no longer feasible or defensible - but is this known to politicians and the public ? Do they want to know this ? What is the level of debate on this subject ?

Andrew McKillop is Project Director, GSO Consulting Associates
Former chief policy analyst, Division A Policy, DG XVII Energy, European Commission.



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