Dear Dick,

The Bush administration is adamant about developing and building a new generation of nuclear weapons (they're calling it the "Reliable Replacement Warhead" (RRW) program). There's a chance to kill that terrible idea, but it's up to the Senate.

Right now, Senate leaders are drafting their spending bill that could terminate the nuclear weapons program entirely. This is our best shot to end funding of new nuclear weapons. Email your Senators and tell them to support an Energy and Water Appropriations bill that cuts all spending for new nuclear weapons.

Recently, the House threw a wrench in the administration's expensive and unnecessary nuclear program by denying the President's funding request for new nuclear weapons. ¹ The Senate should follow the lead of the House by cutting all funding for the Reliable Replacement Warhead Program in their spending bill. We should be working to make the world a safer, more peaceful place, not funding and building more nuclear weapons.

Decisions about this bill are being made now. So be sure to email your senators today and ask them to do everything they can to pass a bill that cuts all funding to the nuclear weapons program.

We have a real chance to end funding for nuclear weapons, but the Senate needs to hear from as many of us as possible. After you've taken action, be sure to send this message onto your friends so they can get involved.

Darcy Scott Martin
TrueMajority.org Washington Director


You can read more about the RRW program at the Union of Concerned Scientists website.

Here is the message we'll send to your senators:

I know that the Senate is working on drafting the Energy and Water Appropriations bill, which would define spending for the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) program.

I also know that the House of Representatives recently cut all funding for the RRW program in their bill and I hope the Senate will terminate this program.

We should be working to make the world safer, not funding and building more nuclear weapons. Please use your elected position and influence to call for a bill that cuts all funding for new nuclear weapons.
EARTH SHOULD BE WEAPONS FREE ZONE

SPEECH TO THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES
By David Krieger
March 15, 2007

It is a great honor to celebrate with you the 40th anniversary year of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, officially called the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean. This Treaty was a great achievement, and has served your region well.

Many years ago, I had the pleasure of knowing and working with Alfonso Garcia Robles, the great Mexican diplomat who was so instrumental in creating this treaty. For his vision and commitment, he shared the 1982 Nobel Peace Prize with Swedish diplomat Alva Myrdal.

The Treaty of Tlatelolco paved the way and was a model for other Nuclear Weapon Free Zones – those in the South Pacific, Southeast Asia, Africa, and Central Asia. Today, virtually the entirety of the southern hemisphere is covered by Nuclear Weapon Free Zones. Latin America and the Caribbean led the way in this important achievement.

But, as great as the achievement has been in creating first the Nuclear Weapon Free Zone for Latin America and Caribbean, and then the southern hemispheric series of Nuclear Weapon Free Zones, it is not enough. While regional efforts are useful, they cannot fully protect the people of the region from the effects of nuclear wars in other parts of the world.

Latin America and the Caribbean cannot rest easy in the belief that your region can be protected against nuclear devastation. So long as there are nuclear weapons in the world, your region, although it has acted with such reason and sanity, remains endangered. Nuclear weapons anywhere are a threat to people everywhere.

In 1995, the parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) agreed at the Treaty’s Review and Extension Conference that they would pursue “systematic and progressive efforts” to achieve nuclear disarmament. Among the commitments made in 1995 was one to the creation of a
**Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).** The international community moved quickly from that point, and the CTBT was opened for signatures in 1996.

At the **2000 NPT Review Conference** the parties reached agreement on 13 Practical Steps for Nuclear Disarmament, including on “[t]he importance and urgency of signatures and ratifications, without delay and without conditions and in accordance with constitutional processes, to achieve the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.” The parties further agreed to an “unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals....”

More than 10 years have passed since the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference, and this critical Treaty has not yet entered into force. To do so, the Treaty requires the signatures of the 44 nuclear-capable states. As of now, there are still 10 nuclear-capable states that have not ratified the Treaty, including two NPT nuclear weapons states, the United States and China. Israel, not a party to the NPT, also has not ratified the CTBT. Other nuclear weapons states that are not parties to the NPT – India, Pakistan and North Korea – have not even signed the Treaty. Some of the nuclear weapons states that have signed the CTBT, such as the United States, have continued to evade the spirit of the treaty by conducting nuclear weapons tests by other means, including computer simulations and sub-critical tests.

Now, more than 15 years after the end of the Cold War and some 37 years after the entry into force of the **Non-Proliferation Treaty**, the commitments to nuclear disarmament made by the nuclear weapons states in **Article VI of the Treaty** remain unfulfilled. We must conclude that these states are failing in their obligations to the international community and to humanity as a whole. One of these states, the most powerful one, is a member of the Organization of American States. It is my own country, the United States.

Viewed objectively, the **United States** has made some progress in reducing its nuclear arsenal, but it has also demonstrated its commitment to maintaining its nuclear arsenal for the indefinite future. The United States has shown no leadership toward fulfilling its obligations under **Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty** – the principal obligation being good faith negotiations to achieve complete nuclear disarmament. This obligation was unanimously confirmed by the International Court of Justice in its 1996 **Advisory Opinion on the Legality of Nuclear Weapons**, which stated that the Article VI obligation was to “bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects....”

Certain questions must be posed:

Do non-nuclear weapons states have a **responsibility** with regard to the failure of the nuclear weapons states to act to fulfill their obligations for nuclear disarmament?

Do non-nuclear weapons states have **self-interest** in the success or failure of the nuclear weapons states to fulfill their Article VI obligations for nuclear disarmament?

What can non-nuclear weapons states do when the nuclear weapons states fail to fulfill their obligations to achieve nuclear disarmament?

I would say that the answer to the first two questions is certainly Yes. It is, in a sense, analogous to the idea that “friends do not let friends drive drunk.” There is both a responsibility and self-interest in keeping drunks from driving. By preventing a drunken friend from driving, you serve their interest as well as your own.
What can be done to take away the keys to launch the nuclear-armed missiles from a drunken nuclear weapons state poses a more difficult problem. In one sense, the nuclear weapons states are the most powerful states in the world – in terms of the damage they can inflict on others. But in another sense, they are the most vulnerable states because they expose their citizenry to retaliatory nuclear annihilation.

I suggest to you that this issue of nuclear vulnerability is a serious one. In today’s world, all states, including the nuclear weapons states themselves, could be held hostage to nuclear weapons in the hands of terrorist groups. Thus, there must be zero tolerance for nuclear weapons falling into the hands of terrorists. But in a world in which some countries rely upon nuclear weapons for their security, there is always the possibility for these weapons to fall into the hands of criminals and extremists; terror-minded individuals and organizations that could not be deterred from using them. In such a situation, even a country with thousands of nuclear weapons would be helpless against a nuclear attack.

When we consider the possibility of nuclear terrorism, it is hard not to think that nuclear weapons in any hands, including those of the nuclear weapons states, do not constitute a form of such terrorism. The mere possession of these weapons constitutes an implicit threat to use them under certain but not defined circumstances.

One thing should be clear: Nuclear weapons cannot provide protection against a nuclear attack. They can only deter such an attack if a country is subject to being deterred. Nuclear weapons cannot protect against accidents, miscalculations, false alarms, or terrorist attacks. The only way to assure that such attacks do not occur is to verifiably eliminate all nuclear weapons, and to place the materials and technologies to create these weapons under strict international control.

The United States wants to develop a new type of nuclear warhead, one it calls the “Reliable Replacement Warhead.” Why? Because the United States seems to want to rely upon nuclear weapons for its security forever – and it wants these weapons to be able to reliably defeat any enemy, regardless of the financial and human costs.

The United States has pushed Russia into an unfortunate agreement, the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT). This treaty will reduce deployed strategic nuclear warheads in both countries’ arsenals to 2,200 or less by 2012. However, the Treaty does not require the reductions to be irreversible, transparent or verified, and after 2012 these countries can expand their nuclear arsenals as they please.

The United States has developed contingency plans for the use of nuclear weapons against both nuclear and non-nuclear weapons states, and Mr. Bush seems to favor preventive war and keeping all options on the table. The United States is pressing forward with missile defenses, forcing Russia and China to strengthen their offensive nuclear forces. Add to this that the United States has blocked nearly every proposal for multilateral progress on nuclear disarmament and you can see that the United States is driving drunk. It needs the help and intervention of its friends.

The world has come close to nuclear weapons use in the past. Perhaps the closest was the October 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. But it came close again in 1995 when Boris Yeltsin was awakened in the middle of the night and told that Russia was facing a US nuclear attack. In fact, a US-Norwegian Weather Satellite had been launched from Norway, and the Russian command had misinterpreted this as an attack on Russia. The Russian black box with launch codes was placed
before Yeltsin, and he was given only moments to decide whether to launch a “counter-attack” against the US – an attack that could have led to an all-out nuclear war. Fortunately Yeltsin waited and it became apparent that the missile was not headed toward Russia. I ask you to consider, though, the immense dangers involved in leaving the decision to initiate a nuclear war in the hands of any individual, even those who do not drink themselves to sleep at night.

As a citizen of the United States, I would pose the question: In the Americas, why should only Latin American and Caribbean citizens have the advantages of living within a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone? The idea of a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone is so powerful that all citizens of Earth should aspire to this. The needed **Nuclear Weapon Free Zone** is, of course, that of the **Earth itself**. So I am here to solicit your help in pushing my country into a leadership role to achieve this great goal.

It can only be hoped that the United States will not always be as short-sighted and reckless in its use of force as it has been in recent years under the current administration. After World War II and the trials at **Nuremberg**, it should be unacceptable for leaders anywhere to engage in aggressive war without being held to account by the international community.

Please add your official voices to those of the many citizens of the United States who work with vigor and persistence to achieve the goal of a nuclear weapons-free planet. I believe it is the shared duty of all non-nuclear weapons states to exert maximum pressure on the United States and the other nuclear weapons states to urgently take the following steps toward achieving a nuclear weapons-free world:

1. Immediately take all nuclear weapons off high alert status and take all necessary precautions to assure that nuclear war could not commence by accident.

2. Make legally binding commitments not to use nuclear weapons first under any circumstances, nor to use them under any circumstances against non-nuclear weapons states.

3. Repatriate all nuclear weapons from foreign soil and from the seas to the territory of their possessors. It is time to stop accepting the misuse of the oceans, the common heritage of humankind, as a hiding place for nuclear arms.

4. Bring the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty into force, cease seeking to evade the spirit of the CTBT by conducting computer simulations and sub-critical tests, and close the Nevada Test Site in the US and Novaya Zemyla Test Site in Russia, as China has closed Lop Nor and France has closed its Pacific Test Site.

5. Enter into a treaty to ban all nuclear weapons and other weapons from outer space.

6. Convene a meeting of all states, including all nuclear weapons states, for the purpose of negotiating a Nuclear Weapons Convention for the phased elimination of all nuclear weapons.

The former vice president of the United States, Al Gore, has awakened tens of millions of people across the planet to the dangers of global warming with his film, “An Inconvenient Truth.” Another “inconvenient truth” is that more than 27,000 nuclear weapons, over 95 percent in the arsenals of the United States and Russia, continue to threaten our cities, our countries, our civilizations, and life on Earth.
In Latin America and the Caribbean you have been leaders in carving out a portion of the planet to be free from nuclear weapons. As you celebrate the 40th anniversary year of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, please keep firmly in mind that this great accomplishment is not the fulfillment of the final goal. Finishing the job requires assuring that the rest of the Earth, the northern as well as the southern hemisphere, also be made nuclear weapons-free before our common human future is assured.

I fear that there exists far too much complacency about nuclear weapons, and I ask for your leadership as though the future of our precious planet depended upon it. Such leadership is now needed, as it was when you created the Treaty of Tlatelolco. In the spirit of Alfonso Garcia Robles and also your great Latin American poet, Pablo Neruda, I ask for your leadership to break out of this complacency and to challenge those nations and leaders that continue to hold humanity hostage to the threat of nuclear annihilation. It is not enough to limit the sphere of nuclear weapons or their testing; we must eliminate the weapons themselves – all of them. This is the great challenge of our particular time on Earth.

As Albert Einstein and Bertrand Russell wrote in their famous Manifesto in 1955: “There lies before us, if we choose, continual progress in happiness, knowledge, and wisdom. Shall we, instead, choose death, because we cannot forget our quarrels? We appeal as human beings to human beings: Remember your humanity, and forget the rest.”

David Krieger is President of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation (www.wagingpeace.org), and a leader in the global effort to abolish nuclear weapons. This speech was delivered at OAS Headquarters on Washington, DC on March 15, 2007 in a “Special Meeting on Consolidation of the Regime Established in the Treaty of Tlatelolco and on the Worldwide Comprehensive Test Ban.”

Dear Friends,

Reprinted below is a very important speech by Kofi Annan. Near the end of his second term as Secretary General of the United Nations, he is making a clarion call to people everywhere to deal with the dangers of nuclear weapons, which he views as the greatest problem confronting humanity (“a unique existential threat to all humanity”), by tackling both nuclear proliferation and nuclear disarmament “with the urgency they demand.”

He calls upon the nuclear weapons states “to develop concrete plans – with specific timetables – for implementing their disarmament commitments.” He also urges them “to make a joint declaration of intent to achieve the progressive elimination of all nuclear weapons, under strict and effective international control.”

At the end of his remarks he appeals to young people: “Please bring your energy and imagination to this debate. Help us to seize control of the rogue aircraft on which humanity has embarked, and bring it to a safe landing before it is too late.”
This speech may well be viewed as the Secretary General’s greatest gift to humanity. I urge you to read it and to demand far more serious action on this critical issue by the leaders of the nuclear weapons states, those currently in control of “the rogue aircraft on which humanity has embarked...."

David Krieger
President
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
PMB 121, 1187 Coast Village Road, Suite 1
Santa Barbara, CA 93108
www.wagingpeace.org
www.nuclearfiles.org

Click here to add your voice to a growing movement for peace and a nuclear weapons-free world
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IN LECTURE AT PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, SECRETARY-GENERAL CALLS FOR PROGRESS ON BOTH NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT, NON-PROLIFERATION

Following is the text of today’s lecture by UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan at Princeton University:

Let me begin by saying how delighted I am to have been invited to give this address by a School named after Woodrow Wilson, the great pioneer of multilateralism and advocate of world peace, who argued, among other things, for agreed international limits on deadly weapons.

Princeton is indissolubly linked with the memory of Albert Einstein and many other great scientists who played a role in making this country the first nuclear power. That makes it an especially appropriate setting for my address this evening, because my main theme is the danger of nuclear weapons, and the urgent need to confront that danger by preventing proliferation and promoting disarmament, both at once. I shall argue that these two objectives — disarmament and non-proliferation — are inextricably linked, and that to achieve progress on either front we must also advance on the other.

Almost everyone in today’s world feels insecure, but not everyone feels insecure about the same thing. Different threats seem more urgent to people in different parts of the world.

Probably the largest number would give priority to economic and social threats, including poverty, environmental degradation and infectious disease.

Others might stress inter-State conflict; yet others internal conflict, including civil war. Many people — especially but not only in the developed world — would now put terrorism at the top of their list.

In truth, all these threats are interconnected, and all cut across national frontiers. We need common global strategies to deal with all of them — and indeed, Governments are coming together to work out and implement such strategies, in the UN and elsewhere. The one area where there is a total lack of any common strategy is the one that may well present the greatest danger of all: the area of nuclear weapons.
Why do I consider it the greatest danger? For three reasons:

First, nuclear weapons present a unique existential threat to all humanity.

Secondly, the nuclear non-proliferation regime now faces a major crisis of confidence. North Korea has withdrawn from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), while India, Israel, and Pakistan have never joined it. There are, at least, serious questions about the nature of Iran’s nuclear programme. And this, in turn, raises questions about the legitimacy, and credibility, of the case-by-case approach to non-proliferation that the existing nuclear powers have adopted.

Thirdly, the rise of terrorism, with the danger that nuclear weapons might be acquired by terrorists, greatly increases the danger that they will be used.

Yet, despite the grave, all-encompassing nature of this threat, the Governments of the world are addressing it selectively, not comprehensively.

In one way, that’s understandable. The very idea of global self-annihilation is unbearable to think about. But, that is no excuse. We must try to imagine the human and environmental consequences of a nuclear bomb exploding in one, or even in several, major world cities — or indeed of an all-out confrontation between two nuclear-armed States.

In focusing on nuclear weapons, I am not seeking to minimize the problem of chemical and biological ones, which are also weapons of mass destruction, and are banned under international treaties. Indeed, perhaps the most important, under-addressed threat relating to terrorism — one which acutely requires new thinking — is the threat of terrorists using a biological weapon.

But, nuclear weapons are the most dangerous. Even a single bomb can destroy an entire city, as we know from the terrible example of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and today, there are bombs many times as powerful as those. These weapons pose a unique threat to humanity as a whole.

Forty years ago, understanding that this danger must be avoided at all costs, nearly all States in the world came together and forged a grand bargain, embodied in the NPT.

In essence, that treaty was a contract between the recognized nuclear-weapon States at that time and the rest of the international community. The nuclear-weapon States undertook to negotiate in good faith on nuclear disarmament, to prevent proliferation, and to facilitate the peaceful use of nuclear energy, while separately declaring that they would refrain from threatening non-nuclear-weapon States with nuclear weapons. In return, the rest committed themselves not to acquire or manufacture nuclear weapons, and to place all their nuclear activities under the verification of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Thus, the treaty was designed both to prevent proliferation and to advance disarmament, while assuring the right of all States, under specified conditions, to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

From 1970 — when it entered into force — until quite recently, the NPT was widely seen as a cornerstone of global security. It had confounded the dire predictions of its critics. Nuclear weapons did not — and still have not — spread to dozens of States, as John F. Kennedy and others predicted in the 1960s. In fact, more States have given up their ambitions for nuclear weapons than have acquired them.

And yet, in recent years, the NPT has come under withering criticism — because the international community has been unable to agree how to apply it to specific crises in South Asia, the Korean peninsula and the Middle East; and because a few States parties to the treaty are
allegedly pursuing their own nuclear-weapons capabilities.

Twice in 2005, Governments had a chance to strengthen the Treaty’s foundations — first at the Review conference in May, then at the World Summit in September. Both times they failed — essentially because they couldn’t agree whether non-proliferation or disarmament should come first.

The advocates of “non-proliferation first” — mainly nuclear-weapon States and their supporters — believe the main danger arises not from nuclear weapons as such, but from the character of those who possess them, and therefore, from the spread of nuclear weapons to new States and to non-state actors (so called “horizontal proliferation”). The nuclear-weapon States say they have carried out significant disarmament since the end of the cold war, but that their responsibility for international peace and security requires them to maintain a nuclear deterrent.

“Disarmament first” advocates, on the other hand, say that the world is most imperilled by existing nuclear arsenals and their continual improvement (so called “vertical proliferation”). Many non-nuclear-weapon States accuse the nuclear-weapon States of retreating from commitments they made in 1995 (when the NPT was extended indefinitely) and reiterated as recently as the year 2000. For these countries, the NPT “grand bargain” has become a swindle. They note that the UN Security Council has often described the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction as a threat to international peace and security, but has never declared that nuclear weapons in and of themselves are such a threat. They see no serious movement towards nuclear disarmament, and claim that the lack of such movement presages a permanent “apartheid” between nuclear “haves” and “have-nots”.

Both sides in this debate feel that the existence of four additional States with nuclear weapons, outside the NPT, serves only to sharpen their argument.

The debate echoes a much older argument: are weapons a cause or a symptom of conflict? I believe both debates are sterile, counterproductive, and based on false dichotomies.

Arms build-ups can give rise to threats leading to conflict; and political conflicts can motivate the acquisition of arms. Efforts are needed both to reduce arms and to reduce conflict. Likewise, efforts are needed to achieve both disarmament and non-proliferation.

Yet, each side waits for the other to move. The result is that “mutually assured destruction” has been replaced by mutually assured paralysis. This sends a terrible signal of disunity and waning respect for the Treaty’s authority. It creates a vacuum that can be exploited.

I said earlier this year that we are “sleepwalking towards disaster”. In truth, it is worse than that — we are asleep at the controls of a fast-moving aircraft. Unless we wake up and take control, the outcome is all too predictable.

An aircraft, of course, can remain airborne only if both wings are in working order. We cannot choose between non-proliferation and disarmament. We must tackle both tasks with the urgency they demand.

Allow me to offer my thoughts to each side in turn.

To those who insist on disarmament first, I say this:
-- Proliferation is not a threat only, or even mainly, to those who already have nuclear weapons. The more fingers there are on nuclear triggers, and the more those fingers belong to leaders of unstable States — or, even worse, non-State actors — the greater the threat to all humankind.

-- Lack of progress on disarmament is no excuse for not addressing the dangers of proliferation. No State should imagine that, by pushing ahead with a nuclear-weapon programme, it can pose as a defender of the NPT; still less that it will persuade others to disarm.

-- I know some influential States, which themselves have scrupulously respected the Treaty, feel strongly that the nuclear-weapon States have not lived up to their disarmament obligations. But, they must be careful not to let their resentment put them on the side of the proliferators. They should state clearly that acquiring prohibited weapons never serves the cause of their elimination. Proliferation only makes disarmament even harder to achieve.

-- I urge all States to give credit where it is due. Acknowledge disarmament whenever it does occur. Applaud the moves which nuclear-weapon States have made, whether unilaterally or through negotiation, to reduce nuclear arsenals or prevent their expansion. Recognize that the nuclear-weapon States have virtually stopped producing new fissile material for weapons, and are maintaining moratoria on nuclear tests.

-- Likewise, support even small steps to contain proliferation, such as efforts to improve export controls on goods needed to make weapons of mass destruction, as mandated by Security Council resolution 1540.

-- And please support the efforts of the Director-General of the IAEA and others to find ways of guaranteeing that all States have access to fuel and services for their civilian nuclear programmes without spreading sensitive technology. Countries must be able to meet their growing energy needs through such programmes, but we cannot afford a world where more and more countries develop the most sensitive phases of the nuclear fuel cycle themselves.

-- Finally, do not encourage, or allow, any State to make its compliance with initiatives to eliminate nuclear weapons, or halt their proliferation, conditional on concessions from other States on other issues. The preservation of human life on this planet is too important to be used as a hostage.

To those who insist on non-proliferation first, I say this:

--True, there has been some progress on nuclear disarmament since the end of the cold war. Some States have removed many nuclear weapons from deployment, and eliminated whole classes of nuclear delivery systems. The US and Russia have agreed to limit the number of strategic nuclear weapons they deploy, and have removed non-strategic ones from ships and submarines; the US Congress refused to fund the so called “bunker-buster” bomb; most nuclear test sites have been closed; and there are national moratoria on nuclear tests, while three nuclear-weapon States — France, Russia and the UK — have ratified the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

-- Yet, stockpiles remain alarmingly high: 27,000 nuclear weapons reportedly remain in service, of which about 12,000 are actively deployed.

-- Some States seem to believe they need fewer weapons, but smaller and more useable ones — and even to have embraced the notion of using such weapons in conflict. All of the NPT
nuclear-weapon States are modernizing their nuclear arsenals or their delivery systems. They should not imagine that this will be accepted as compatible with the NPT. Everyone will see it for what it is: a euphemism for nuclear re-armament.

-- Nor is it clear how these States propose to deal with the four nuclear-weapon-capable States outside the NPT. They warn against a nuclear domino effect, if this or that country is allowed to acquire a nuclear capability, but they do not seem to know how to prevent it, or how to respond to it once it has happened. Surely they should at least consider attempting a “reverse domino effect”, in which systematic and sustained reductions in nuclear arsenals would devalue the currency of nuclear weapons, and encourage others to follow suit.

-- Instead, by clinging to and modernizing their own arsenals, even when there is no obvious threat to their national security that nuclear weapons could deter, nuclear-weapon States encourage others — particularly those that do face real threats in their own region — to regard nuclear weapons as essential, both to their security and to their status. It would be much easier to confront proliferators, if the very existence of nuclear weapons were universally acknowledged as dangerous and ultimately illegitimate.

-- Similarly, States that wish to discourage others from undertaking nuclear or missile tests could argue their case much more convincingly if they themselves moved quickly to bring the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty into force, halt their own missile testing, and negotiate a robust multilateral instrument regulating missiles. Such steps would do more than anything else to advance the cause of non-proliferation.

-- Important Powers such as Argentina, Brazil, Germany and Japan haveshown, by refusing to develop them, that nuclear weapons are not essential to either security or status. South Africa destroyed its arsenal and joined the NPT. Belarus, Ukraine and Kazakhstan gave up nuclear weapons from the former Soviet nuclear arsenal. And Libya has abandoned its nuclear and chemical weapons programmes. The nuclear weapon States have applauded all these examples. They should follow them.

-- Finally, Governments and civil society in many countries are increasingly questioning the relevance of the cold war doctrine of nuclear deterrence — the rationale used by all States that possess nuclear weapons — in an age of growing threats from non-State actors. Do we not need, instead, to develop agreed strategies for preventing proliferation?

For all these reasons, I call on all the States with nuclear weapons to develop concrete plans — with specific timetables — for implementing their disarmament commitments. And I urge them to make a joint declaration of intent to achieve the progressive elimination of all nuclear weapons, under strict and effective international control.

In short, my friends, the only way forward is to make progress on both fronts — non-proliferation and disarmament — at once. And we will not achieve this unless at the same time we deal effectively with the threat of terrorism, as well as the threats, both real and rhetorical, which drive particular States or regimes to seek security, however misguidedly, by developing or acquiring nuclear weapons.

It is a complex and daunting task, which calls for leadership, for the establishment of trust, for dialogue and negotiation. But first of all, we need a renewed debate, which must be inclusive, must respect the norms of international negotiations, and must reaffirm the multilateral approach — Woodrow Wilson’s approach, firmly grounded in international institutions, treaties, rules, and norms
of appropriate behaviour.

Let me conclude by appealing to young people everywhere, since there are — I am glad to see — so many of them here today.

My dear young friends, you are already admirably engaged in the struggle for global development, for human rights and to protect the environment. Please bring your energy and imagination to this debate. Help us to seize control of the rogue aircraft on which humanity has embarked, and bring it to a safe landing before it is too late.

***

###

AMERICA’S DIALOGUE: NEW FILM ABOUT NUCLEARISM

> Dick Bennett <jbennet@uark.edu> wrote:
> Please send me 3 copies if you can, or I will copy one, and I will see that they are viewed. We are very concerned over US nuclear aggression and treaty violations.
> From: "James Hilgendorf"
> To:
> Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 2007 3:23 PM
> Subject: America's Dialogue
> I'm writing from Eugene, Oregon, to let you know about an unprecedented week of national grassroots discussions taking place April 14-22, 2007; and to invite your participation and your help in getting the word out to friends and acquaintances all across the country. The project is AMERICA'S DIALOGUE. You can get more information at: > http://www.americasdialogue.org.
> These discussions will be centering around a new 42-minute video about Hiroshima, nuclear weapons, nuclear waste, and the human cost of militarism and war. The video will serve both as an educational experience for millions of Americans, young and old, and as the catalyst for our discussions about America.
> The video - AMERICA'S DIALOGUE - is available on DVD; but people can also form discussion groups and view the video on their computer on our website. The following page connects you to the video on our > site and to the video on Google Video: > http://www.americasdialogue.org/watchvideo.html.
> If you would like a DVD to show at a meeting, just let me know the exact address and I'll be glad to send a copy. You're free to copy the DVD and share it with others. You can also use the video as part of a fundraiser or membership drive for your own group if you like.
> We'd love to hear from you - any ideas and suggestions and plans to
NUCLEAR WEAPONS WASTE IN LANDFILLS
May 14, 2007
Contacts: Diane D’Arrigo, 301-270-6477 ext. 16; Mary Olson (NIRS Southeast) (after 1 PM eastern), 828-675-1792

New Report Finds Nuclear Weapons Materials Released to Landfills
Pathways Open for Reuse and Recycling

Takoma Park, MD – Radioactive materials are being released from nuclear weapons facilities to regular landfills and could get into commercial recycling streams, finds a new report released today by Nuclear Information and Resource Service (NIRS).

The report: *Out of Control – On Purpose: DOE’s Dispersal of Radioactive Waste into Landfills and Consumer Products* – was commissioned to track if and how the Department of Energy (DOE) releases some of the radioactive wastes from nuclear bomb production.

The report authors, led by Diane D’Arrigo, NIRS’ Radioactive Waste Project Director, researched seven sites and the DOE national headquarters. The seven sites were: Oak Ridge TN, Rocky Flats CO, Los Alamos NM, Mound and Fernald OH, West Valley NY, and Paducah KY.

“People around regular trash landfills will be shocked to learn that radioactive contamination from nuclear weapons production is ending up there, either directly released by DOE or via brokers and processors,” D’Arrigo said. “Just as ominous, the DOE allows and encourages sale and donation of some radioactively contaminated materials.”

The report tracked the laws, guidance and technical justifications that DOE uses to rationalize allowing radioactive scrap, concrete, equipment, asphalt, plastic, wood, chemicals, soil, and more out to landfills, commercial businesses and recreation areas, recycling and reuse in places unprepared to handle radioactivity. Applauding DOE’s ban on recycling of radioactive metal from nuclear weapons, the report cautions there are loopholes and it is again threatened.

“DOE is ignoring public opposition to unnecessary exposures and releasing radioactivity even though the U.S. Congress revoked such release policies,” said Mary Olson, director of the NIRS Southeast office and a co-author of the report. “DOE is using its own internal guidance to allow radioactive weapons wastes out of control, claiming the doses to people will be ‘acceptable’ even though they are not enforced or tracked.”

Under the current system, the DOE and other nuclear waste generators release materials directly, sell them at auction or through exchanges or send their waste to processors who can then release it from radioactive controls to landfills, to recyclers or for reuse.
The report found that the State of Tennessee is a leader in licensing processors that can release radioactive materials for the nuclear waste generators. “Tennessee is serving as a funnel to bring in nuclear weapons and power waste from around the country to disperse into the landfills and recycling without public knowledge,” D'Arrigo said. The waste is processed by state-licensed companies and in some cases "redefined" as "special" then released to regular landfills. This free release also opens up the potential for the materials to enter the recycling stream to make everyday household and personal items or to be used to build roads, schools, and playgrounds. "As long as DOE and other nuclear waste generators can slip their contamination out –letting it get Out of Control – On Purpose – there is really no limit to the amount of additional radiation exposure members of the public could receive," D'Arrigo concluded. “Only an informed, outraged public can force DOE and agreeable states to shift the goal from dispersal to isolation of radioactive waste.”

A copy of the full report can be found on the NIRS web site at:
http://www.nirs.org/radwaste/outofcontrol/outofcontrol.htm
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