

**Rhetoric vs Reality: Translating Feel-Good Proclamations
into Attainable Security Realities**

Jacqueline Cabasso, November 14, 2009
North Suburban Peace Initiative, Evanston, Illinois

Many thanks to the North Suburban Peace Initiative and to my friend Marcia Bernsten for inviting me to speak on the occasion of your 30th anniversary. Congratulations! 30 years is a real achievement in our line of work.

The title of my talk is “Rhetoric vs Reality: Translating Feel-Good Proclamations into Attainable Security Realities.” There’s no way I’m going to cover every aspect of this vast subject in my prepared remarks, so I will try to leave time for questions and discussion.

I would like to start with a quote from Mahatma Gandhi that is not widely known:

Shortly after the U.S. atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945, Gandhi said:

“It has been suggested by American friends that the atom bomb will bring in Ahimsa [Non-violence] as nothing else can. It will, if it is meant that its destructive power will so disgust the world that it will turn away from violence for the time being. This is very like a man glutting himself with dainties [sweets] to the point of nausea and turning away from them, only to return with redoubled zeal after the affect of the nausea is well over. Precisely in this manner will the world return to violence with renewed zeal after the effect of the disgust is worn out.

So far as I can see, the atomic bomb has deadened the finest feeling that has sustained mankind for ages.... The atom bomb brought an empty victory to the allied armies but it resulted for the time being in destroying the soul of Japan. What has happened to the soul of the destroying nation is yet too early to see....”

I think my generation has seen it very clearly.

As Hiroshima Mayor Takashi Hiraoka testified to the International Court of Justice 1n 1995:

“History is written by the victors. Thus, the heinous massacre that was Hiroshima has been handed down to us as a perfectly justified act of war. As a result, for over 50 years we have never directly confronted the full implications of this terrifying act for the future of the human race.”

Here’s another perspective. In an essay written after the round of Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests in 1998, Dr. Amulya Reddy, an eminent Indian scientist wrote: “A visit to Poland in September 1999 brought me in direct contact with the realities of the Holocaust, and simultaneously intensified my opposition to the nuclear tests of May 1999.” He went on to describe his visits to the Nazi concentration camps of Auschwitz and Birkenau, now museums.

“The most powerful impression that persisted was of detailed engineering resulting in ‘the immense technological complex created for the purpose of killing human beings.’ The meticulous organization and rigorous management were characteristic of mega-industries. The camps were ‘gigantic and horrific factories of death’ The main gate of Auschwitz displayed the inscription “Arbeit macht frei” (Work brings freedom.). Perhaps ‘Technology completely decoupled from values’ would have been more appropriate. . . .

Walking through the scene of genocide in Auschwitz, one begins to think of historical parallels. In particular, one wonders whether there is a difference between the Nazi concentration camps and the development of the atom bombs at Los Alamos, the test at Alamogordo, and the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki (which resulted in the virtually instantaneous annihilation of hundreds of thousands of people). Of course, the Allies in World War II were not driven by the racism of the Nazis, and they were not pursuing the final solution of extermination of any particular religious group. But with regard to the scale of the killing, the recruitment of capable minds, the harnessing of science and technology, the extent of organization, the resort to efficient project management methods, and the choice of targets to maximize annihilation of Japanese civilians – the Manhattan project and its follow-up were like the concentration camps, in fact, even more horrible in their impact.”

In my travels around the world over the past year, I have been struck that in every forum, President Obama’s April 5 Prague speech has been praised as a world-changing event. In part, I think, this reflects our collective sense of relief that that Bush era is over, as well as our desperate desire for a real breakthrough on nuclear disarmament. One thing is certain. Obama’s Prague speech has inspired a tidal wave of hope and opened up the space for a badly needed renewal of advocacy and action to abolish nuclear weapons. However, Obama made a number of conflicting statements in his Prague speech, and his foreign policy is similarly characterized by contradictory positions. These include renouncing torture, but refusing to prosecute the torturers; planning for the withdrawal of US troops from Iraq, but escalating the US military presence in Afghanistan; and promoting diplomacy and the rule of law while conducting bombing raids on civilian targets in Afghanistan and Pakistan using unmanned drone aircraft. And, I’m sorry to have to tell you that both President Obama, and Vice-President Biden, as Senators, before they were elected, voted in favor of the proliferation-provocative US-India nuclear sharing deal.

Some commentators have characterized Obama’s pledge to “to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons,” as unprecedented. Yet in the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty itself, the U.S. and the other original nuclear weapon states pledged to negotiate the elimination of their nuclear arsenals *in good faith*. So, 40 years later, and 20 years after the end of the Cold War and the dissolution of the Soviet Union, why are nuclear weapons still with us? Who benefits from them? I think we need to do a much deeper analysis in order to figure out where the real pressure points are. And I think this requires openness to the possibility of doing things differently than we’ve done them before. My main conclusion, as I’ll explain, is that we can no longer approach nuclear weapons as a single issue. In order to succeed, we must address the interconnected issues of militarization, globalization, and the economy, and we must build a new movement that brings together the various constituencies that together make up the vast majority of the world’s population that does not benefit from the permanent war system. In order to attract these constituencies we need to develop and promote an alternative vision of security

centered on meeting human needs and protecting the environment to replace the outmoded, unsustainable and fundamentally undemocratic concept of national security premised on overwhelming military might.

President Obama's promising rhetoric about nuclear disarmament notwithstanding, let's take a closer look at the reality behind the rhetoric and the current state of the soul of the destroying nation.

In his April 5 Prague speech, Obama made an historic admission that "as the only nuclear power to have used a nuclear weapon, the United States has a moral responsibility to act" for their elimination. This is a welcome acknowledgement, but we should not be naïve. While Obama has repeatedly said that he will pursue the goal of a world without nuclear weapons, this statement is invariably followed by a disclaimer that as long as nuclear weapons exist, the U.S. will maintain a strong nuclear deterrent. Just yesterday, speaking in Tokyo he reiterated, "As long as nuclear weapons exist, we will retain our deterrent for our people and our allies." This disclaimer reflects the influence of a massive and powerfully entrenched military-industrial complex which has successfully perpetuated the role of nuclear weapons as the cornerstone of U.S. national security policy for 64 years. While the personality at the top of the U.S. government has changed, the architecture and special interests that underpin it have not. The U.S. continues to spend nearly as much as the rest of the world's countries combined on its military. And former government officials, Generals, and other influential members of the nuclear establishment are now engaged in a full court press to ensure that even the modest first steps taken by President Obama to reestablish traditional arms control are doomed to fail.

For example, the Commission established by Congress to give advice on the forthcoming Nuclear Posture Review, reported in May, "The United States requires a stockpile of nuclear weapons that is safe, secure, and reliable, and whose threatened use in military conflict would be credible... The conditions that might make the elimination of nuclear weapons possible are not present today and establishing such conditions would require a fundamental transformation of the world political order."

Almost as if to ensure that such conditions are not created, the Senate recently adopted a series of amendments to the 2010 Defense Authorization Bill. One of these amendments calls on the President to make sure that the U.S.-Russia START follow-on treaty does not limit U.S. ballistic missile defense systems, space capabilities, or advanced conventional weapons systems *These are precisely the issues that Russia has raised as impediments to deeper nuclear arms reductions*. Yet another amendment requires the President to deliver a plan to modernize the U.S. nuclear deterrent.

Even more alarming, its author, Senator John Kyle (R-AZ), along with Senators Byrd (D-WV), Levin (D-MI), McCain (R-AZ), Kerry (D-MA), and Lugar (R-IN), on July 23, signed a letter to the President calling on him to submit, in connection with the new START treaty, a plan "to modernize the nuclear weapons infrastructure, maintain the key capabilities and competencies of the nuclear weapons workforce – (the designers and the technicians), and to maintain the delivery platforms." In effect, nuclear weapons forever! All of the amendments were adopted by

voice votes, meaning that many Democrats, as well as Republicans, said “Aye.” This is what we’re up against!!

And a similar set of anti-disarmament conditions will be attached to CTBT ratification – thus rendering the historic intent of the treaty mute and making it even more unlikely that the other holdout states will ratify it – unless we mobilize effectively to demand a “clean” CTBT, without conditions, that is a real disarmament measure.

President Obama needs our help to earn his Nobel Peace Prize. It is up to us to create the political pressure that will make meaningful progress on disarmament possible.

As a committed nuclear abolitionist, I want to examine here some of the “inconvenient truths” that lie between this new wave of promising rhetoric and the realities that will have to be addressed to bring its promise to fruition. These include: the continuity of “national security” doctrines in the post-World War II and post-Cold War eras, despite dramatically changed geopolitical conditions; the power and influence of entrenched military-industrial complexes and other special interests; the role of nuclear arsenals in maintaining an undemocratic and economically polarized global order; the inherently dual use nature of the nuclear fuel cycle and nuclear energy’s inextricable link to institutions and development patterns that sustain an inequitable status quo; and the fact that nuclear disarmament is unlikely so long as major powers continue to pursue global or regional military dominance, including with conventional weapons. In a time of twin global economic and environmental crises and growing competition over natural resources, the dangers of conflicts among nuclear-armed states are increasing. We cannot afford to wait decades more for the elimination of nuclear weapons. Nuclear disarmament cannot be contingent on solving all of the world’s other problems. But we cannot avoid the connections either. I’ve reached the conclusion that: ***Nuclear disarmament should serve as the leading edge of a global trend towards demilitarization and redirecting resources to meet human needs and restore the environment.***

Putting nuclear weapons in context

The United States spends as much as the rest of the world’s countries combined on its military. In fiscal year 2008, the United States spent \$52.4 billion on nuclear weapons-related programs alone. This staggering amount – a low estimate - is a drop in the bucket compared to overall U.S. military spending that year (\$711 billion), but it exceeds the entire military budgets of nearly every other country. In 2006, the last year for which figures are available, only China (\$121.9 billion), Russia (\$70 billion), the United Kingdom (\$55.4 billion) and France (\$54 billion) spent more on their militaries than the U.S. spent on its nuclear weapons related programs.

President Obama’s remarks in Prague notwithstanding, this is what he said when he presented his military budget request for 2010: “Going forward, we will continue to make the investments necessary to strengthen our military and increase our ground forces to defeat the threats of the 21st Century.”

To meet the challenge of abolishing nuclear weapons, we must broaden our understanding of how nuclear weapons fit into a historical continuum and a larger scheme. The Encarta

Encyclopedia describes militarism as “*advocacy of an ever-stronger military as a primary goal of society, even at the cost of other social priorities and liberties.*” Unfortunately, this definition accurately describes the historical trajectory and still the current reality of U.S. national security policy. The threatened first use of nuclear weapons remains at the heart of that policy. In many cases the architecture of U.S. militarism is “hidden in plain sight,” yet is kept out of mainstream discourse. Elements include more than 800 overseas bases in over 130 countries, and an additional 6,000 bases in the United States and its territories, maintained by the Pentagon. The U.S. military dominates the globe through its operation of 10 Unified Combatant Commands whose areas of operation now cover the entire Earth, the final piece being Africom – the Africa Command. The US is currently building new bases in Colombia, and if additional troops are sent to Afghanistan, we will build more bases there as well. The 230 years of United States history have been marked by nearly continuous military interventions around the world.

Nuclear weapons exist within -- and not apart from -- this system of extended military bases and Unified Combatant Commands, and the history it derives from. The U.S. is the *only* country that deploys nuclear weapons on foreign soil, at NATO bases in five European countries.

Another element of the “hidden architecture” is the nuclear weapons infrastructure itself -- the laboratories and production facilities that derive from the Manhattan Project – so chillingly described by Dr. Reddy.

Unfortunately, the U.S. practice of dominating the globe through projection of overwhelming military power complicates prospects for global nuclear disarmament.

Continuity of “National Security” Doctrines

In late 1997, eight years after the end of the Cold War and four years before the September 11, 2001 attacks, President Bill Clinton signed Presidential Decision Directive-60 (PDD-60), recommitting the U.S. to nuclear weapons as the “cornerstone” of its national security and reaffirming the U.S. policies of threatened first use and threatened massive retaliation. In fact, PDD-60 reiterated a U.S. national security policy that had been reaffirmed by every President, Republican or Democrat, since 1945, when President Harry Truman, a Democrat, ordered the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Reprising his campaign rhetoric in Prague, President Obama declared: “To put an end to Cold War thinking, we will reduce the role of nuclear weapons in our national security strategy, and urge others to do the same.” But this was immediately followed by: “Make no mistake: As long as these weapons exist, the United States will maintain a safe, secure and effective arsenal to deter any adversary, and guarantee that defense to our allies.” What does deterrence mean in U.S. national security doctrine?

As stated in a September 2008 Department of Defense Report on the Air Force’s Nuclear Mission:

“Though our consistent goal has been to avoid *actual* weapons use, the nuclear deterrent is ‘used’ every day by assuring friends and allies, dissuading opponents from seeking

peer capabilities to the United States, deterring attacks on the United States and its allies from potential adversaries, and providing the potential to defeat adversaries if deterrence fails.”

In other words, the U.S. uses the threat of nuclear attack the same way a bank robber might use a gun held to temple of a bank teller. In his 2007 book, “Empire and the Bomb: How the US Uses Nuclear Weapons to Dominate the World,” Joseph Gerson wrote:

“On at least 30 occasions since the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, every US President has prepared and/or threatened to initiate nuclear war during international crises, confrontations, and wars – primarily in the Third world.”

Here’s another description of nuclear deterrence, by Strategic Command Vice-Admiral Carl Mauney, in January of this year. Strategic Command, headquartered in Omaha, Nebraska, is responsible for U.S. nuclear war planning.

“Some argue that the only legitimate role for our nuclear weapons is to deter nuclear weapon use by others against us or our allies, and this is probably their most important role, but the deterrence roles of U.S. nuclear forces goes well beyond deterrence of nuclear attack. U.S. nuclear forces continue to play other roles in strategic deterrence. They cast a long shadow over the decision-making of any adversary attempting attacks on U.S. vital interests or contemplating such attacks. They make it clear that the American President always has an option of last resort for which the adversary has no effective counter. They pose what’s been called the threat that leaves something to chance, the possibility in the mind of the adversary that their actions could result in unintended or uncontrolled escalation. And these are the deterrence dynamics that only nuclear weapons can provide. *If we were to decide to forego nuclear weapons altogether in the future, we’d have to reconsider the fundamentals of our deterrent strategy for it would no longer be built on the firm foundation that the nuclear arsenal provides today.*”

Keep this understanding in mind when you read the news. The policy of nuclear deterrence is not passive and it is not benign.

According to September 2008 Department of Defense Report on the Air Force’s Nuclear Mission:

“The quality and *credibility* of U.S. nuclear forces, and New Triad forces more broadly, are critical to an effective deterrent.”

The “New Triad” forces refer to the combination of nuclear and high-tech conventional offensive strike capabilities (swords) and defensive systems (shields) at the core of U.S. global warfighting strategy. The third leg of the triad is a “responsive” research and development infrastructure – including the nuclear weapons labs - that supports the other two legs. These three elements are bound together by “enhanced command and control” and “intelligence systems.”

Power and Influence of Entrenched Interests

According to its proponents, maintaining this “credible” deterrent will require a massive investment in the nuclear weapons infrastructure. In March 2008, General Kevin Chilton, Commander of Strategic Command, told Congress:

“If the nation is going to maintain a nuclear deterrent, the capabilities that support this deterrent should be second to none. We must care for the stockpile whether we possess one weapon or thousands. . . improvements to our aging infrastructure will be required whether or not we decide to pursue an improved warhead design. . . . The transition to a more modern stockpile will re-invigorate the design and engineering technology base – especially its human resources – and enable a more responsive and cost-effective infrastructure. A revitalized infrastructure will facilitate a reduction of the large inventory of weapons we maintain today as a hedge against strategic uncertainty and weapon reliability concerns, and will allow us to sustain our nuclear capability and expertise throughout the 21st Century.”

Just last week, General Chilton predicted the United States will still need nuclear weapons 40 years into the future. Chilton said his prediction was not inconsistent with the president's vision of a nuclear-free world.

According to General Chilton: "The president himself has said such a world will not be reached quickly and perhaps not in his lifetime and I agree with that." He added that the idea of a world without nuclear weapons "includes a vision of a different world order than what we have today."

“That's why most people who talk about that vision caveat it with 'I don't think it will happen in my lifetime.' It's not because we couldn't physically cut up every weapon in the world in 40 years. We could... The question is would it be a safer world if we did.” He said his command must focus on “the president's confirmation that as long as nuclear weapons exist the United States will maintain a safe, secure and effective arsenal to deter any adversary and to guarantee that defense to our allies.”

To this end, the U.S. nuclear weapons research and production infrastructure is being renovated through a program with a constantly changing name – it was Complex 2030, then “Complex Transformation,” now Stockpile Management. At the end of September, the Democratically-controlled Congress voted to spend \$6.4 billion in FY 2010 to maintain and enhance the safety, security and reliability of the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile – slightly more than this year. This includes the “Stockpile Life Extension” Program for the W76 Sea-Launched Ballistic Missile warhead, carried aboard the 14 U.S. Trident submarines currently patrolling the world's oceans, ready to target any location on earth with a computer keystrokes. Under this program the W76 is being given a new capacity to destroy “hard targets,” making it more suitable for a first-strike. It also includes funding to study modernization of the B61 gravity bomb, and plan for a “long-term 21st century weapon.” And it increases funding for production of plutonium pits – the cores of hydrogen bombs – at the Los Alamos Lab.

According to Defense Secretary Robert Gates, kept on by President Obama from the Bush administration, a Congressionally mandated review of U.S. nuclear strategy, currently underway, known as the Nuclear Posture Review, is likely to recommend development of new warhead designs under the guise of “safety and reliability” as part of a broader effort to maintain the nation’s nuclear deterrent (there’s that word again.)

Strategic Stability

Perhaps even more dangerous than nuclear warhead modifications, are upgrades to delivery systems for conventional weapons. According to General Chilton:

“While our nuclear capability remains vital, our ability to integrate conventional long-range precision weapons is every bit as important.... *We have a prompt global strike delivery capability on alert today, but it is configured only with nuclear weapons, which limits the options available to the President and may in some cases reduce the credibility of our deterrence.*”

With Strategic Command’s full support, the Pentagon and its contractors are poised to begin development of a new generation of long range delivery systems capable of carrying conventional warheads that would allow the United States to strike any target in on earth within 60 minutes or less. Those at the receiving end would have no way of knowing if the incoming missile was nuclear, and if they had a nuclear capability they would probably use it.

Russian security analysts have raised concerns that these conventional U.S. “alternatives” to nuclear weapons might pose an obstacle to U.S. – Russian nuclear arms control negotiations. According to Alexi Arbatov, a scholar in residence at the Carnegie Moscow Center, “There are very few countries in the world that are afraid of American nuclear weapons. But there are many countries which are afraid of American conventional weapons. In particular, nuclear weapons states like China and Russia are primarily concerned about growing American conventional, precision-guided, long-range capability, [or] Prompt Global Strike systems.” Arbatov added that what he termed “threshold states,” nations with potential for developing a nuclear weapon, are similarly concerned about U.S. conventional capabilities.

Paradoxically, using almost the same words, Robert Einhorn, a Clinton administration nuclear policy expert and arms control advocate – now Special Advisor for Nonproliferation and Arms Control to Secretary of State *Hillary* Clinton -- was quoted in 2007: “We should be putting far more effort into developing more effective conventional weapons. *“It’s hard to imagine a president using nuclear weapons under almost any circumstance, but no one doubts our willingness to use conventional weapons.”* This statement, unfortunately, is all too true. But an even more overpowering conventional U.S. military threat surely is not the desired outcome of the nuclear disarmament process. Moreover, how practical would that approach be? How would potential adversaries with fewer economic resources - especially those on the “enemies” list - respond? Wouldn’t they have an incentive to maintain or acquire nuclear weapons to counter overwhelming U.S. conventional military superiority? And wouldn’t that, in turn, even further entrench U.S. determination to retain and modernize its own nuclear arsenal, thus rendering the goal of nuclear disarmament nearly impossible? *This conundrum is one of the biggest challenges we face and it cannot be ignored.*

During the period in the run up to the 2008 U.S. Presidential election, there was a rash of reports and presentations by branches of the Armed Services, nuclear scientists and military commanders espousing future requirements for nuclear weapons and a central role for nuclear weapons in the 21st century. These documents reflect the positioning of powerful entrenched military-industrial complex interests in anticipation of a new Administration.

A U.S. Air Force report, released on October 24, 2008, less than two weeks before the election, presents a “Strategic Plan to Reinvigorate the Air Force Nuclear Enterprise.” It concludes:

“Nuclear forces continue to represent the ultimate deterrence capability that supports U.S. national security. Because of their immense destructive power, nuclear weapons, as recognized in the 2006 National Security Strategy, deter in a way that simply cannot be duplicated by other weapons. Additionally, the special nature of nuclear weapons demands precise performance across the Air Force nuclear enterprise, with no tolerance for complacency or shortcuts. *In short, we will continue to fortify current operations, develop our people, and sustain and modernize current capabilities.*”

While government officials and the media warn us in alarmist terms about the dangers posed by North Korean and Iranian tests of short and medium range missiles, incapable of reaching the United States, in support of this objective the US conducts about 4 tests of ICBM’s each year, from Vandenberg Airforce Base on the central coast of California to Kwajalein atoll in the Marshall Islands, over 4000 miles away. The next such test was scheduled for Nov. 17, but it was suddenly cancelled for unexplained reasons.

Mirroring U.S. national security policy, “The new face of the Russian Armed Forces until 2030,” a draft military doctrine to be presented to Russian President Medvedev for consideration by the end of this year (the same timeline as the US Nuclear Posture Review), affirms that the nuclear triad of ballistic missiles, nuclear powered submarines and strategic bombers will remain the core of Russian armed forces for the next two decades. While planning for new high-tech conventional weapons, Russia will continue to maintain a strong nuclear deterrent. And Russia’s Strategic Missile Forces will continue the deployment of new ballistic missile systems, modernization of strategic command-and-control networks and the development of enhanced warheads and their delivery systems. It has recently been reported that the head of Russia’s Security Council, Nikolai Patrushev has said that the revised military doctrine would stipulate for preemptive nuclear strikes against potential aggressors and the use of nuclear weapons not only in large-scale conventional wars but also in regional and local conflicts. According to one analysis, this message is not really a change in doctrine but a deterrent threat against NATO and China.

Not to let the other members of the nuclear club off the hook, in his speech of March 21, 2008, presenting France’s aptly-named new nuclear submarine, “*Le Terrible*,” in Cherbourg, French President Nikolai Sarkozy proclaimed: “Our nuclear deterrence protects us from any aggression against our vital interests emanating from a state – wherever it may come from and whatever form it may take.”

To the ever-fluid definition of deterrence, he added: “It cannot be ruled out that an adversary might miscalculate the delimitation of our vital interests or our determination to safeguard them. *In the framework of nuclear deterrence, it would be possible, in that event, to send a nuclear warning that would underscore our resolve.* That would be aimed at reestablishing deterrence.”

These remarks were made in connection with a pledge to reduce the number of French nuclear warheads to fewer than 300, but providing no details or timeline. (By comparison, according to the Joint Understanding for the START follow on treaty signed by Presidents Obama and Medvedev in July, the US and Russia have pledged to reduce their deployed strategic warheads to a range of 1500 – 1675 each, seven years after the treaty is signed – by 2016, Obama’s last year in office if he’s reelected, and it doesn’t cover tactical warheads or reserve stockpiles, doesn’t required dismantlement of any warheads, and doesn’t fundamentally alter US and Russian nuclear postures.

France’s nuclear partner, the UK, while also announcing cuts to its arsenal (fewer than 200), is proceeding with plans to replace its Trident nuclear weapons system, while pursuing massive development of its Atomic Weapons Establishment at Aldermaston. In addition, and without Parliament’s agreement, the British government has endorsed the use of its Menwith Hill radar station for the U.S. missile defense system – recently reconfigured by the Obama administration to rely on short-range and theater systems instead of long-range ground-based interceptors. Instead of 10 long range interceptors based in Poland, the new plan is to install 30 shorter range interceptors!

Of the five Nuclear Weapon States Parties to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), China is the only one believed to be increasing its numbers of nuclear weapons, roughly 25% since 2005, with a total stockpile estimated at 240 warheads.

The other states with nuclear weapons are Israel (est 200 – 300), Pakistan (est 90?), India (est 80?) and North Korea (?). No one knows for sure how many nuclear weapons *any* country has.

In a major speech to the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace on October 28, 2008, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, kept on from the Bush Administration by President Obama, began by noting that

“[T]hree presidents I worked for during the Cold War, Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush, genuinely wanted to eliminate all nuclear weapons and said so publicly. More recently, George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger and Sam Nunn echoed that sentiment in *The Wall Street Journal*, but all have come up against the reality that as long as others have nuclear weapons, we must maintain some level of these weapons ourselves to deter potential adversaries and to reassure over two dozen allies and partners who rely on our nuclear umbrella for their security, making it unnecessary for them to develop their own.”

He continued:

“Try as we might and hope as we will, the power of nuclear weapons and their strategic impact is a genie that cannot be put back in the bottle, at least for a very long time. While we have a long-

term goal of abolishing nuclear weapons once and for all, given the world in which we live, we have to be realistic about that proposition.”

In other words, Gates seemed to be saying, it’s unfortunate, but as long as nuclear weapons exist, nuclear weapons will exist!

In a profoundly disturbing speech to the US Institute of Peace on Oct. 21, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said: “We are sincere in our pursuit of a secure peaceful world without nuclear weapons. But until we reach that point of the horizon where the last nuclear weapon has been eliminated, we need to reinforce the domestic consensus that America will maintain the nuclear infrastructure needed to sustain a safe and effective deterrent without nuclear testing.

So in addition to supporting a robust nuclear complex budget in 2011, we will also support a new Stockpile Management Program that would focus on sustaining capabilities.” Citing General Chilton she added: “This is what the military leaders, charged with responsibility for our strategic deterrent, need in order to defend our country.”

The Inextricable Links

Fueled by the corporate-driven campaign for a nuclear power “renaissance,” the pursuit of nuclear energy has become a leading cause of conflict around the world due to the inherently dual use nature of the nuclear fuel cycle. The U.S. – India nuclear deal, approved by Congress in October 2008, will provide India, a non-NPT party, with nuclear technology and materials that might enable it to further develop its weapons program. Pakistan and Israel, both non-NPT nuclear-armed states, are reportedly pursuing similar deals. The potential for further inflaming already volatile regions of the world by adding nuclear capacity is obvious. However, there is another less frequently examined dimension to this problem.

Nuclear power, the most expensive form of centralized electricity generation, is an inefficient way to deliver energy to the world’s vast underserved populations, particularly those in rural areas. Investing the immense capital needed to construct nuclear plants in decentralized, renewable energy technologies world-wide also would promote further innovation and bring down prices, encouraging their spread. This approach would improve energy access, provide employment, and broaden the economic potential of areas left out of the current system of corporate globalization, reducing both greenhouse gas emissions and oil consumption, and reducing as a consequence competition for shrinking oil and gas supplies that is, among other things, a significant factor driving global conflict.

We simply must phase out and move beyond nuclear power, as well as fossil fuels, if we are to achieve a world of human and ecological security.

Seriously moving toward abolition of nuclear weapons will require taking on other challenges, together with nuclear disarmament or on parallel tracks. But this is not a reason to delay any longer eliminating the role of nuclear weapons in national security policies – which will require *delegitimizing deterrence* – and getting on with the process of their verified physical destruction.

Indeed, some of these challenges are beginning to be discussed openly in policy circles. At a recent conference at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, DC, Vladimir Orlov, a Russian security analyst, predicted that Moscow might raise the issue of conventional weapons in the next phase of U.S.-Russian nuclear arms reduction negotiations, which could begin after an anticipated initial treaty is completed by the end of this year. Of particular concern, he said, are “strategic weapons which can be used not only in nuclear but in conventional” modes. And, he suggested that addressing “Prompt Global Strike” should be just the start. According to Orlov, “Very dramatic reductions in military expenditure in the world: This is where the United States clearly – even more than in nuclear disarmament – should take the lead.”

This view was underscored by former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev at a recent high-level conference in Rome. “Defense budgets far exceed reasonable security needs,” Gorbachev said. “The United States spends on military purposes almost as much as the rest of the world put together.” And, he warned: “Military superiority would be an insurmountable obstacle to ridding the world of nuclear weapons. *Unless we discuss demilitarization of international politics, the reduction of military budgets, preventing militarization of outer space, talking about a nuclear-free world will be just rhetorical.*”

As UN SG Ban Ki-Moon wrote in an editorial published on Nagasaki-day in August: “I am urging progress in eliminating other weapons of mass destruction and limiting missiles, space weapons and conventional arms - all of which are needed for a nuclear weapons- free world. *Disarmament must anticipate emerging dangers from other weapons.*”

Redefining Security

Atomic Audit, a study by the Brookings Institution completed in 1998, found, as a *conservative* estimate, that the United States spent \$5.5 trillion dollars on nuclear weapons from 1940–1996 (in constant 1996 dollars). The Brookings study found that nuclear weapons spending during the 56 year period it examined exceeded the combined total federal spending for education; training, employment, and social services; agriculture; natural resources and the environment; general science, space, and technology; community and regional development, including disaster relief; law enforcement; and energy production and regulation.

What is to be done? The answer is clear to everyone in this room, and to ordinary people everywhere. We need to fundamentally redefine security. We must put universal human security and ecological sustainability at the heart of conflict resolution and prevention. We must divest precious resources from militarism and invest them instead in this new security paradigm. Fortunately, one excellent vehicle for moving in this direction is already in place.

The United Nations Millennium Development Goals, agreed by all of the world’s governments, are designed to: eradicate extreme poverty and hunger; achieve universal primary education; promote gender equality and empower women; reduce child mortality; improve maternal health; combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases; ensure environmental sustainability; and develop a global partnership for development.

The Hiroshima-Nagasaki Protocol, put forward by Mayors for Peace, provides a vision and a plan of action for immediate cessation of all nuclear weapons activities and commencement of negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention to be completed by 2015 and implemented by 2020. By happy coincidence, the specific milestones established in each category of the Millennium Development Goals are to be met within the same timebound framework!

Fulfilling these commitments will cost far less than war. Each year about \$1.3 Trillion dollars goes into the world's military coffers. The best estimates are that a ten year commitment of around \$76 billion per year, less than 7% of current military expenditures, would lead to fulfillment of the Millennium Development Goals.

However, the UN Food and Agriculture Organization recently warned that world hunger is worsening and that unless investments are greatly increased the MDG goal of halving the number of those living in hunger and poverty by 2015 will not be met. The FAO projects that global food output will have to increase by 70% to feed a projected population of 9.1 billion in 2050. To achieve that, poor countries will need \$44 billion yearly in aid to agriculture, compared with the current \$7.9 billion, to increase access to irrigation systems, modern machinery, as well as to build roads and train farmers.

Our choice is clear.

“The Fierce Urgency of Now.”

Lately there's been a lot of rhetoric about the U.S. and Russia “getting down to” 1000 nuclear weapons on each side. But, as President Obama reminded us in Prague: “One nuclear weapon exploded in one city – be it New York or Moscow, Islamabad or Mumbai, Tokyo or Tel Aviv, Paris or Prague – could kill hundreds of thousands of people. And no matter where it happens, there is no end to what the consequences might be - for our global safety, our security, our society, our economy, to our ultimate survival.”

Unfortunately, while recognizing this urgent danger and calling for a world without nuclear weapons, Obama demurred: “I'm not naive. This goal will not be reached quickly - perhaps not in my lifetime. It will take patience and persistence. But now we, too, must ignore the voices who tell us that the world cannot change. We have to insist, ‘Yes, we can.’”

Secretary Clinton added insult to injury in her Oct. 21 speech when she said: “As the President has acknowledged, we might not achieve the ambition of a world without weapons within our lifetime or *successive* lifetimes.”

I want to say a few words about time bound frameworks. Governments set milestones all the time. Paradoxically, on May 8, during this year's NPT Preparatory Committee meeting, President Obama announced the U.S. goal by 2020 of having the highest college graduation rates of any country on Earth. And during his recent campaign for health care legislation he told reporters: “if there are no deadlines, nothing gets done in this town.” So why not set a goal of eliminating nuclear weapons by 2020 as Mayors for Peace has done?

A great American, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in a prescient speech exactly one year before his tragic assassination in 1968, described our current predicament: “We are now faced with the fact, my friends, that tomorrow is today. We are confronted with the fierce urgency of now. In this unfolding conundrum of life and history, there is such a thing as being too late. Procrastination is still the thief of time.... Over the bleached bones and jumbled residues of numerous civilizations are written the pathetic words, ‘Too late’.... We still have a choice today: nonviolent coexistence or violent coannihilation. We must move past indecision to action.”

The 2010 NPT Review Conference is widely seen as a make- it-or- break- it point for the long term viability of the nuclear non-proliferation regime. Non nuclear weapon states are rightly expecting the nuclear weapon states to finally make good on their Article VI disarmament obligation – in force since 1970. It is therefore more important than ever that we, the ordinary people of the world, join together to demand the elimination of nuclear weapons -- before the last hibakusha is gone!

Sources of hope

Inspired by Japanese NGOs, a growing international petition campaign is underway calling on the leaders of governments to agree at the 2010 NPT Review Conference to commence and conclude negotiation of a treaty to ban and eliminate nuclear weapons within a timebound framework. The U.S. version of the petition calls on President Obama to make good on his Prague commitment by announcing at the Review Conference his initiation of good faith multilateral negotiations on an international agreement to abolish nuclear weapons, within our lifetimes. Millions of signatures collected in Japan, the U.S., U.K., France and elsewhere will be delivered to the NPT Review Conference.

In June, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, an association of Mayors of cities with populations over 30,000 – as mainstream as it gets -- unanimously adopted a Mayors for Peace resolution that:

“welcomes enthusiastically the new leadership and multilateralism that the United States is demonstrating toward achievement of a nuclear-weapon-free world, and calls on President Obama to announce at the 2010 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference the initiation of good faith multilateral negotiations on an international agreement to abolish nuclear weapons by the year 2020”

In July, the International Trade Union Confederation launched an international campaign for nuclear disarmament with its own petition endorsing the Mayors for Peace 2020 vision campaign and adding:

“We call for major reductions in military expenditure, to allow this money to be spent on social and economic development and fighting poverty. We further ask that this transition from military to peaceful expenditure be done in a way which protects the livelihoods of those who would be affected by it.”

The ITUC represents 170 million workers in 312 affiliated national organizations from 157 countries. The AFL-CIO is the US affiliate,

One hundred forty-nine U.S. mayors are members of Mayors for Peace, which is headed internationally by the dynamic mayors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The organization has grown dramatically from less than 600 members in 2003 to more than 3,200 cities in 134 countries. From now through May 2010, a major focus of the 2020 vision campaign is an unprecedented membership drive, we're calling Cities Are Not Targets, that aims to expand Mayors for Peace to 5000 cities. The total population represented by its first 3000 cities was over 600,000,000 people worldwide. With our help, these 5000 cities will represent over one billion people – one-sixth of humanity – calling for the global elimination of nuclear weapons by 2020 and the elimination of hunger, poverty, discrimination, violence and environmental destruction by shifting funds from preparations for war to activities that promote peace.

American organizers are excited that as many as 1,000 Japanese activists will come to New York next May to personally deliver their appeal for a peaceful world free of nuclear weapons. With United for Peace and Justice and Abolition 2000, we are organizing a major march and rally on Sunday May 2, the day before the Review Conference opens, and a big international conference on linking nuclear weapons abolition with peace, energy, the environment and the economy on April 30 and May 1 at the historic Riverside Church where Martin Luther King gave his groundbreaking “Beyond Vietnam; A Call to Conscience” speech in 1967, exactly one year before he was assassinated. As in 2005, we anticipate that the march will be led by hibakusha and Mayors for Peace, followed by Japanese and other international peace activists.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I can't do better than to quote again from UNSG Ban Ki-Moon:

“Global security challenges are serious enough without the risks from nuclear weapons or their acquisition by additional states or non-state actors. Of course, strategic stability, trust among nations, and the settlement of regional conflicts would all help to advance the process of disarmament. Yet disarmament has its own contributions to make in serving these goals and should not be postponed. It will restore hope for a more peaceful, secure and prosperous future. *It deserves everybody's support.*”

On October 2, I had the pleasure of speaking at the San Francisco celebration of the kick-off of World March for Peace and Nonviolence. The World March began in New Zealand on October 2, 2009, the anniversary of Gandhi's birth, declared the “International Day of Nonviolence” by the United Nations. It will conclude in the Andes Mountains (Punta de Vacas, Aconcagua, Argentina) on January 2, 2010. The March will last 90 days. It will pass through all climates and seasons, from the hot summer of the tropics and the deserts, to the winter of Siberia. A permanent base of a hundred people of different nationalities will complete the journey. *The World March began in New Zealand and will travel the world asking for the end of wars, the dismantling of nuclear weapons and for an end to all forms of violence (physical, economic, racial, religious, cultural, sexual and psychological).*

In our current world, nothing could be more important than encircling the globe with a life-affirming comprehensive call for peace and nonviolence. Indeed, I believe that nonviolence is hope, because nonviolence is the belief that change is possible.

I opened with a quote from Gandhi, and I will close with another:

‘The moral to be legitimately drawn from the supreme tragedy of the bomb is that it will not be destroyed by counter-bombs even as violence cannot be by counter-violence. Mankind has to get out of violence only through non-violence. Hatred can be overcome only by love. Counter-hatred only increases the surface as well as the depth of hatred...’

And, he explained how social transformation will come from the bottom up.

“We have to make truth and non-violence not matters for mere individual practice, but for practice by groups and communities and nations....

[Before] general disarmament... commences... some nation will have to dare to disarm herself and take large risks. The level of non-violence in that nation, if that event happily comes to pass, will naturally have risen so high as to command universal respect. Her judgment will be unerring, her decisions firm, her capacity for heroic self-sacrifice will be great, and she will want to live as much for other nations as for herself.”