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The OMNI Center for Peace, Justice, and Ecology remembers Hiroshima and Nagasaki, (with the United Nations) renounces war and threats of war, joins the ICAN (Nobel Peace Prize) and Global Zero nuclear weapons abolition movement, and celebrates the UN Treaty to Ban Nuclear Weapons.

OMNI Center will hold its annual Hiroshima Nagasaki Memorial

Sunday August 11, 2019, 6:00 pm, at the UUFF

Today’s anticipatory message emphasizes nuclear weapons.
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OMNI continues its membership in the campaign to abolish nuclear weapons by protesting weekly against US economic and military war on Iran, grateful to have one candidate for the president, Tulsi Gabbard, strongly speaking out against US militarism and empire. In the following she recognizes the importance of mayors in this campaign, for the mayors must defend the infrastructures of their towns despite the squandering of the treasury in illegal and unnecessary wars abroad. Speak to your mayor. Tell her or him you want a conversion of our money from destruction to construction. --Dick

Tulsi Gabbard: We must end wasteful wars (Video)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ouLekdI_X_Y#action=share

Tulsi Gabbard Is Right: War and Nuclear Proliferation Are Local Issues

The presidential contender is warning mayors that misguided and misdirected foreign policies cost cities vital resources. By John Nichols JULY 1, 2019

https://www.thenation.com/article/tulsi-gabbard-2020-nuclear/

Tulsi Gabbard speaking at podium

Google Trends found that after the first Democratic presidential debate in Miami, Tulsi Gabbard was the most searched candidate. Makes sense. The congresswoman from Hawaii brought a bold critique of “regime-change wars,” nuclear proliferation, and failed foreign policies to the debate stage. She made statements that some characterized as controversial and that others thought necessary; she reflected on her apology for socially conservative positions she once embraced; and she engaged in one of the few actual debates in the debate: a clash with Ohio Congressman Tim Ryan over continued US involvement in Afghanistan that saw Gabbard win loud applause for her declaration that “we have to bring our troops home.”

She also delivered one of the most effective takedowns of President Trump and his inner circle heard during two nights of debating. “War with Iran would be worse than war with Iraq,” the Iraq War veteran, who is the first female combat veteran ever to seek the nomination for the presidency, announced on Wednesday night. “Donald Trump and his chickenhawk cabinet—Mike Pompeo, John Bolton, and others—are creating a situation where a spark would light a war with Iran. Trump needs to get back into the Iran deal, swallow his pride, and put America first.”

But last week’s debate stages were so crowded that none of the candidates, many of whom poll toward the back of a field that now includes more than two dozen contenders, got very far in presenting a nuanced, let alone comprehensive, worldview. Gabbard did more of that when she addressed the 87th Annual US Conference of Mayors over the weekend.
In her speech to the mayors who had gathered in Honolulu, the congresswoman made the case that “regime change wars” are costing communities across the country too much—and that they must be understood as local issues.

“That’s why,” she explained, “it’s imperative that every mayor, every leader at every level of government take action to stand up and speak out about this danger of nuclear war that we’re facing, speak out against these wasteful regime change wars and this new cold war that’s sucking money out of our pockets and our communities.”

That’s an important message that ought not be lost in the 2020 cacophony.

Cities are dramatically impacted by foreign-policy choices, and by the federal budget priorities that extend from them. They also have the potential to be serious players on the global stage. It’s notable that Trump goes out of his way to attack London Mayor Sadiq Khan, and that Khan has emerged as one of the most pointed critics of the American president—writing recently that “Donald Trump is just one of the most egregious examples of a growing global threat. The far right is on the rise around the world, threatening our hard-won rights and freedoms and the values that have defined our liberal, democratic societies for more than seventy years.”

American mayors have joined urban leaders around the world to focus on the climate change issues that the Trump administration neglects. And they have frequently spoken up about international human rights abuses.

Two current mayors, South Bend, Indiana’s Pete Buttigieg and New York City’s Bill de Blasio, joined last week’s debates, as did a former mayor: Vermont Senator Bernie Sanders, who led that state’s largest city for much of the 1980s. Gabbard is not the only candidate who recognizes foreign policy as a local issue. But she is talking about the issue in smart ways.

In particular, she is focusing on the threat posed by nuclear weapons. The congresswoman noted Trump’s dismissive attitude toward agreements that seek to prevent nuclear proliferation, while reminding the mayors of the preparations their cities must make for missile alerts and other potential threats.

Recalling a false alert that caused panic in Hawaii last year, Gabbard told the mayors, “We need a radical change in our foreign policy to prevent this kind of thing from happening, and to make sure that our children and our families and generations to come can live free from fear of a nuclear war.”

Take Action: Stop using the treacherously influential word defense regarding US foreign policy. Say and write: The Department of War.

Action. Ira Helfand. “Ban the Bomb–Before Our Luck Runs Out.” We are closer to a nuclear war than we have ever been. Seven ways it can happen. See at end for complete article or go to https://progressive.org/magazine/ban-the-bomb-helfand/ Ira Helfand is past president of Physicians for Social Responsibility and co-president of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (Nobel Peace Prize 1985).

Bill Lueders, (editor, The Progressive), “The Threats We Face,” same June-July number. “In this issue of The Progressive, we look at existential threats to life on Earth. . . .The threats are real, and growing. . . .No one understands the threat of nuclear war better than Ira Helfand.” See below.


“The Day the World Almost Ended.”

Recounts 7 of the some dozen nuclear catastrophe close calls.

“Blast from the Past.”

Some of the magazine’s past writing on the dangers of nuclear war; for example, the cover story for the Oct. 1978 number imagining the aftermath of a twenty-megaton nuclear explosion over Chicago.
Dick — at any minute, the President of the United States can start a nuclear war all by himself — a war that could kill everyone on the planet.

There’s no such thing as a small nuclear war. You, me, everyone we know and love, would be impacted. It’s terrifying. But it doesn’t have to be this way.

One really simple change, called the No First Use of nuclear weapons policy, can ensure no President — not Donald Trump or whoever follows him — has the ability to start a nuclear war!

Right now, dozens of candidates are running to be our next Commander-in-chief. We need to get them on the record NOW committed to making this important policy shift the official policy for the United States.

ACTIONS

Add your name: demand a public commitment from every 2020 presidential candidate to institute a policy against the first use of nuclear weapons if elected president.

Current U.S. nuclear weapons policy is making the world more dangerous.

And that’s because the U.S. is killing nuclear weapons treaties. The U.S. is spending gobs of money on building new nuclear weapons — including a “gateway nuke” that makes a nuclear war more likely. And the U.S. is destroying hard-earned diplomatic ties that have helped keep the lid on the spread of nuclear weapons around the world.

That makes the decisions of our next commander-in-chief even more consequential, because they’ll have to pull us out of the threat of nuclear annihilation that current U.S. policy is taking us dangerously close to.

We need to ensure NOW that our next President — whoever they are — commits to NOT use nuclear weapons first.

Add your name: demand a public commitment from every 2020 presidential candidate to institute a policy against the first use of nuclear weapons if elected president!

Thank you for working for peace,
Ground Zero Center For Nonviolent Action

Ground Zero Center for Nonviolent Action offers the opportunity to explore the meaning and practice of nonviolence from a perspective of deep spiritual reflection, providing a means for witnessing to and resisting all nuclear weapons, especially Trident. We seek to go to the root of violence and injustice in our world and experience the transforming power of love through nonviolent direct action.

GZ Nonviolence E-News

March 22, 2019

Dear Friends of a world free of nuclear weapons,

I am writing because the Trump administration is engaged in a new, and dangerous, nuclear weapons plan that is like driving a car very fast down a curvy, mountain road with a blindfold - it’s a recipe for disaster! And we need your help to stop it. If you are already familiar with the new "low-yield" Trident warhead (aka: W76-2), skip right to our Take Action page. Otherwise, please read on.

The US Navy’s ballistic missile submarines have always had one sole mission (in the Navy’s own words): “strategic deterrence, which is the act of deterring a nuclear attack with a safe, secure, and effective nuclear-deterrent force.” In other words, the belief that another nation will be deterred from using nuclear weapons as long as it believes it will be destroyed (by nuclear weapons) as a consequence.

Each of the US Navy’s OHIO Class “Trident” ballistic missile submarines is loaded with twenty Trident II D5 missiles in its launch tubes. The missiles are loaded with a mix of W76 and W88 thermonuclear warheads. The W76-1 has an effective yield of 100 kilotons, and the W88 has a yield of 455 kilotons. These are known as strategic (as opposed to tactical) nuclear warheads. For comparison, the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima was approximately 15 kilotons.
The 2018 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) recommended “lowering the yield of some existing submarine-launched ballistic missile warheads…” in order “to keep our deterrent effective for our world today.” The government’s idea was to create a tactical nuclear warhead that would be carried on existing submarine launched missiles as a way of countering Russia.

In September 2018 the Congress provided $65 million for the low-yield warhead as part of an annual spending package in landslide votes in both the House and Senate. The Trump administration believes that a smaller warhead that can be fired from submarines will deter Moscow from using its own tactical nuclear weapons. The new warhead will have a yield of less than 10 kilotons.

If war broke out between NATO and Russia, and even small, tactical, nuclear weapons were introduced (by either side), the results would be beyond imagination – with the escalation that would most likely result, besides the countless lives lost on the European continent, such a conflict could quite possibly break out into the worst-case scenario of a full-scale nuclear war between the US and Russia, and it is safe to say that the survivors would envy the dead.

Production of the new “low-yield” version of the W76-1, known as the W76-2, called for by the Trump administration in 2017, is already underway at the Pantex Plant in Texas, according to the National Nuclear Security Agency. If we do not stop production of the W76-2, it will likely be ready for deployment as early as the Fall of 2019. A small number of Trident missiles will be reconfigured to carry only the W76-2, and some number of these missiles will be carried on each Trident submarine while on patrol.

There is absolutely no way an adversary can know which warheads are on the missile(s) headed in their direction (if it was a “tactical” or a “strategic” strike). If multiple warheads are involved they would quite likely assume the worst case scenario, and would most certainly respond with their full nuclear response, resulting in co-annihilation.

Security experts say that, “Perhaps the biggest fallacy in the whole argument [for the low-yield warhead] is the mistaken and dangerous belief that a ‘small’ nuclear war would remain small… These so-called ‘low-yield’ nuclear weapons are a gateway to a nuclear catastrophe.”

Hans Kristensen, director of the Nuclear Information Project at the Federation of American Scientists, puts it this way: "It's not like the Russians are going to be sitting there saying, 'Well, let's wait to see this one detonate first. Oh, it's a small mushroom cloud! Well, in that case...' A nuke is a nuke. Once it's used, the gloves are off."

Bills have been reintroduced in the new Congress to stop the W76-2 warhead. Representative Ted Lieu has introduced H.R. 1086, and Senator Ed Markey has introduced S. 401; both bills “prohibit the research and development, production, and deployment of the Trident D5 low-yield nuclear warhead, and for other purposes.” Both bills introduced in the previous session of Congress were called the “Hold the LYNE Act”; LYNE standing for low yield nuclear explosive.

Please urge your members of Congress to co-sponsor these bills. Congress must stop the further production, and deployment, of the W76-2!

We have created a campaign at the Ground Zero Take Action page. It has everything you need to take action on this important issue, including Talking Points and more information on why the new "low-yield" warhead is a very bad idea.
Further Actions:
We ask that you call your members of Congress, and if possible to visit their local offices to make
direct contact with their staffers (or with them directly during one of the upcoming recesses).

Please also share this campaign widely with your social networks!

And let us know what kind of response you get from your calls and visits. You can email me at
outreach@gzcenter.org.

On behalf of Ground Zero Center, thanks for working together toward a world free of the threat of
nuclear war,

Leonard Eiger

W76-2/Hold the LYNE Act Campaign at https://www.gzcenter.org/take-action/
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The Trident D5 is a submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM), built by ... Nor is the Navy or the
nation retreating from this violation of international law.
Nonviolence or Nonexistence

Robert C. Koehler | Common Wonders – TRANSCEND Media Service

2 May 2019 – The day before he died, Martin Luther King said these words at a packed church in Memphis: “Men for years now have been talking about war and peace. Now no longer can they just talk about it. It is no longer a choice between violence and nonviolence in this world, it is nonviolence or nonexistence. That is where we are today. ”That’s where we are today . . . half a century later! Read more...

WAR AND WARMING

“Catastrophic climate change and nuclear war are unique in the threat they pose to the very survival of human civilization.” Ira Helfand.

The Other Unimaginable Threat: Climate Change. Increasingly, commentators are seeing WAR AND WARMING as the most pressing threats demanding our attention.

“The other great existential threat we face today is climate change, the subject of an entire recent issue” of The Progressive. This June/July number offers

Bill Lueders, “The Threats We Face” and “It’s a Catastrophe.” Lueders’ conclusion: “These existential threats must be addressed with equal urgency.” Lueders gives high praise to David Wallace-Wells’ book The Uninhabitable Earth and to Naomi Klein’s This Changes Everything, and to the Green New Deal and the video “Message from the Future with Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez,” and he calls for massive immediate civil disobedience to end fossil fuel subsidies. ACTION

Scott Russell, “The Battle Against Line 3.” The struggle against “expansion of a pipeline to transport dirty tar sands oil.”

Alexandra Tempus, “‘We’re Not Going Anywhere’: An Interview with Winona LaDuke.”

Helfand’s article cited above.
Ban the Bomb–Before Our Luck Runs Out

We are closer to a nuclear war than we have ever been.

by Ira Helfand June 1, 2019

https://progressive.org/magazine/ban-the-bomb-helfand/

We are closer to a nuclear war than we have ever been.
That is the assessment of William Perry, who served as Secretary of Defense under President Bill Clinton.

“The likelihood today of a nuclear catastrophe is greater than during the Cold War,” Perry told an audience in Washington, D.C., early in the Trump Administration. “Today, inexplicably to me, we are recreating the geopolitical hostility of the Cold War and we are rebuilding the nuclear dangers of the Cold War. We are doing this without any serious public discussion, or any real understanding of the consequences of these actions: We are sleepwalking into a new Cold War, and there is a very real danger we will blunder into a nuclear war.”

Perry expounded on this theme recently in a Wall Street Journal op-ed co-written with former U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz and former U.S. Senator Sam Nunn, who chaired the Armed Services Committee. The trio warned that the world “may soon be entrenched in a nuclear standoff more precarious, disorienting, and economically costly than the Cold War.” They called for de-escalating tensions caused by Trump’s “dysfunctional Russia policy” by building a framework for strategic stability and announcing a joint declaration affirming the senselessness of nuclear war.

This sense of heightened danger is shared by the experts who set the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists’ Doomsday Clock at two minutes to midnight in January 2018 and reaffirmed that decision in January of this year.

“Humanity now faces two simultaneous existential threats, either of which would be cause for extreme concern and immediate attention,” the group said. “These major threats—nuclear weapons and climate change—were exacerbated this past year by the increased use of information warfare to undermine democracy around the world, amplifying risk from these and other threats and putting the future of civilization in extraordinary danger.”

Among the factors driving concern upward were President Trump’s decision to unilaterally abandon the Iran nuclear deal and withdraw from the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty while joining other nuclear-armed countries in sweeping programs of “nuclear modernization.”

Yet despite these alarming developments, the imminent threat of nuclear war barely registers on most people’s radar. In the early 1980s, the danger of nuclear war emerged as a matter of widespread public concern, with one survey finding that 76 percent of Americans believed nuclear war was “likely” within a few years. Millions of people took political action to stop the Cold War arms race, including a rally in New York City on June 12, 1982, that drew one million people, then the largest political demonstration in U.S. history.

But with the end of the Cold War, people began to think and act as though the danger posed by nuclear weapons had passed.

Of course, the danger never went away. Thousands of nuclear warheads remained, along with the possibility that they would be used, perhaps even by accident. In January 1995, the United States launched a weather rocket from Norway that caused a false alarm in Moscow. We came within minutes of a full scale nuclear war—four years after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War.
Today, at latest count, the nine nuclear nations maintain an arsenal of 14,500 nuclear weapons. The danger of them being used has increased dramatically in recent years (see sidebar). There is an urgent need to rebuild the broad public understanding of this danger to bring about fundamental change in nuclear policy and end that danger once and for all.

We have been incredibly fortunate throughout the nuclear weapons era. As Robert McNamara famously declared after the Cuban Missile Crisis, “We lucked out. It was luck that prevented nuclear war.” The policies of the nuclear weapons states are essentially a hope that this luck will continue. But hoping for good luck is not an acceptable security policy and, sooner or later, our luck will run out.

To erase the threat of unparalleled catastrophe that has existed since the dawn of the nuclear age, we must articulate a clear strategy to eliminate these weapons before they eliminate us.

Internationally, 122 nations voted in July 2017 to adopt the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, which bans the use and possession of nuclear weapons as well as activities that make it possible to build and maintain them. The ratification process is moving forward; when fifty nations formally ratify the treaty it will enter into force, creating a powerful new standard where it is the countries with nuclear weapons who are the ultimate “rogue states.”

Here in the United States, a grassroots campaign called Back from the Brink seeks to embrace the goals of the treaty with a “Green New Deal” for the nuclear threat, a comprehensive prescription for how to avoid nuclear war. It calls on the United States to recognize that nuclear weapons, far from being agents of our security, are in fact the greatest threat to our safety and must be eliminated as the only way to assure that they will not be used.

Representatives Jim McGovern, Democrat of Massachusetts, and Earl Blumenauer, Democrat of Oregon, have drafted a resolution, H.R. 302, to adopt this new policy prescription.

The core of the campaign is a five-point platform of policies that the United States should pursue. The central plank is to commence negotiations with the other eight nuclear weapons states for an enforceable, verifiable, timebound agreement to dismantle nuclear arsenals. There is no guarantee such an initiative will be successful, but there is no reason to assume that it will not be: It has never been tried.

While various U.S. Presidents, including Ronald Reagan, Jimmy Carter, and Barack Obama, have given lip service to the idea that the United States will seek the security of a world free of nuclear weapons, none has actively pursued this goal. That is the fundamental change that must take place and to which we must commit.

The other four planks in the Back from the Brink platform are common-sense steps that can be taken to lessen the danger of nuclear war as these negotiations proceed and the weapons are being dismantled. They are:

1) The United States should adopt a No First Use policy, making it clear that it will not initiate nuclear war. This will reduce tensions during future crises, decrease the possibility of miscalculation by future adversaries, and signal the United States’ disinclination to destroy the world.
Legislation to implement this policy has been introduced in both houses of Congress, the House bill (H.R 921) by Representative Adam Smith, Democrat of Washington, and the Senate bill (S.272) by Senator Elizabeth Warren, Democrat of Massachusetts.

2) We should end the sole unchecked authority of any President to launch a nuclear attack. The Constitution provides unequivocally that only Congress can declare war, but current practice allows the President to initiate a nuclear attack—surely an act of war—without Congressional authorization and without the approval of the Cabinet, the Vice President, or anyone else.

This policy evolved during the Cold War, when it was felt the President needed to be able to respond quickly to an attack from the Soviet Union that might destroy America’s land-based nuclear missiles. The current sea-based Trident missiles are not vulnerable in this way and there is no need to delegate this terrible power to any one individual. Legislation to limit presidential authority has been introduced in the House (H.R. 669) by Representative Ted Lieu, Democrat of California, and in the Senate (S. 200) by Senator Edward Markey, Democrat of Massachusetts.

3) The U.S. nuclear arsenal should be taken off hair-trigger alert. Hundreds of warheads in both the United States and Russia are mounted on missiles that can be launched in fifteen minutes. This makes them vulnerable to cyber attack, accidents, and impulsive or unauthorized decisions. The policy of maintaining weapons in this high-alert state is a vestige of the Cold War and should be abandoned. If the United States decides at some point that it needs to destroy the world, it can wait twenty-four hours to do it.

4) The United States should cancel the plan to replace its entire nuclear arsenal with enhanced weapons. The current plan calls for spending some $1.7 trillion, after inflation, over the next thirty years replacing and enhancing every component of its nuclear arsenal in a program that will assure the existence of nuclear weapons for decades to come (or until they are used). This plan, mirrored by similar efforts in the other nuclear-armed states, will fuel a new and destabilizing arms race. Several bills in Congress seek to curtail this dangerous and unnecessary spending spree including  H.R. 1086, S. 401, H.R. 1231, S. 312, H.R. 1249.

The Back from the Brink campaign has been joined by many civic organizations, faith communities, and professional associations and has won the support of a rapidly growing list of cities, towns, and states. It was endorsed by unanimous votes of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the Baltimore, Los Angeles, and Washington, D.C., city councils and by an overwhelming vote of the California state legislature. It is currently before the state legislatures in Maine, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Oregon, Washington, and Vermont as well as many town and city councils.

Yet, obviously, despite this broad grassroots support, negotiations for the elimination of nuclear weapons will require a paradigm shift in the thinking of the leaders of nuclear-armed states, and aggressive leadership by at least one of the nuclear powers. They must be persuaded by the force of world opinion that nuclear weapons are not necessary for their safety.

In the early 1980s, few expected that the United States and the Soviet Union could overcome their enormous mutual distrust and end the arms race. When Mikhail Gorbachev proposed a halt to all nuclear weapons tests in 1986, the United States initially rebuffed the overture. But he persisted, and over time both he and Ronald Reagan were able to understand that nuclear weapons posed a greater threat to both of their countries than either did to each other.
There is not an obvious successor to Gorbachev among today’s world leaders. But a large group of U.S. politicians are vying for the presidency in 2020 and perhaps one of them will have the wisdom and courage to follow in his footsteps. The United States cannot afford to elect a good President in 2020; it must elect a great President. And the definition of greatness at this time includes the ability to successfully address the threats we face, from nuclear weapons and climate change. The next President must make these top priorities.

Back from the Brink seeks to enlist ordinary citizens in a national campaign that will create the political space and political pressure that will allow the next President to be successful. Like the Nuclear Weapons Freeze Campaign of the 1980s, it seeks to create a national consensus of what nuclear policy ought to be in the hope and belief that such a consensus will lead to fundamental policy change.

It is not enough to work on incremental changes to our nuclear policy. Such changes are valuable, but will not do what must be done. They must be part of an explicit and clearly articulated plan to actually achieve the security of a world free of nuclear weapons, and we must pursue that overall plan now. Time is not on our side.

Sidebar: Seven Possible Pathways to Nuclear War

1. United States and Russia: These two countries together possess more than 90 percent of the world’s nuclear weapons and, despite President Trump’s fondness for Vladimir Putin, relations between them are at the lowest point in thirty years, since the end of the Cold War. Events in Syria and Ukraine and tensions in the Baltics make clear the possibility of conflict. Trump’s recent decision to withdraw from the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty underlines the potentially nuclear nature of a future war.

2. United States and China: The economic rivalry between the world’s two largest economic powers has become increasingly hostile and there is now an active military dimension to that rivalry. Chinese and U.S. naval forces routinely play chicken in the South China Sea, a disastrous incident waiting to happen.

3. United States and North Korea: In early 2018, the United States and North Korea appeared to be headed toward a nuclear confrontation. The “on again, off again” bromance between Donald Trump and Kim Jong-un brought a temporary reprieve, but the collapse of the Hanoi Summit revealed how dangerous the situation remains.

4. South Asia: Perhaps the most dangerous potential conflict is one that receives scarce attention in the West. India and Pakistan have fought four wars; there is almost daily low-level fighting on their disputed border in Kashmir; and the military doctrines of both countries create a high level of concern that a future war between them will go nuclear. Use of less than half of the 290 weapons in their combined nuclear arsenal would cause worldwide climate disruption and a global famine putting two billion people at risk.

5. Climate change: The nuclear powers periodically claim they are willing to get rid of their nuclear weapons—just not yet. They say conditions are not ripe today but, in the future, when the world is safer, they will seek to disarm. Unfortunately, the world is not getting safer. Climate change is placing increasing stress on societies around the world and, as it progresses, there will be increased conflict and mass migration on a scale unprecedented in history. If nuclear weapons remain on the table, the danger that they will be used will also increase.
6. Cyber terrorism: We used to worry that terrorists might build or steal a nuclear weapon and blow up a city like New York or Moscow, and that is still a danger. But the greater danger is that terrorists will carry out a cyber attack that induces one of the nuclear-armed states to launch its nuclear weapons in the mistaken belief that it is under attack.

7. The Trump Factor: Apart from his many wrongheaded policies, Donald Trump’s personal instability increases the danger of nuclear war. This is not a partisan comment; concern about his control over a nuclear arsenal is shared by members of his own party. During the 2016 campaign, fifty prominent Republican security experts warned that Trump “lacks the character, values, and experience” to command a nuclear arsenal. For years, the United States has maintained that it would be intolerable for even a single nuclear weapon to fall into the wrong hands, including a rogue state or a terrorist group. In January 2017, we turned 6,800 nuclear weapons over to Donald Trump.
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Back from the Brink: Hiroshima-Nagasaki Remembrance Program and Nuclear Weapons Abolition, August 12, 2018

The Program, 6pm
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