

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

Unified Approach Needed For Nuclear Disarmament

By Jayantha Dhanapala *

KANDY, SRI LANKA, Jan (IPS) The only viable normative approach regarding nuclear weapons is their total and universal elimination under strict verification. This cannot be achieved by incremental steps but only by the negotiation of a Nuclear Weapons Convention as advocated by the UN Secretary-General.

Today, there are some grounds to hope for a reconciliation of the broken marriage between nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Both US President Obama and Russian President Medvedev have repeatedly indicated their support for achieving a world free of nuclear weapons. We may be heading for a new age of deproliferation, a reversal both of the spread of these weapons and of their perpetuation and further improvement.

http://www.nuclearabolition.net/documents/COLUMN-unified_approach_needed_for_nuclear_disarmament.pdf



Iran Uses Fear of Covert Nuclear Sites to Deter Attack

Analysis by Gareth Porter*

WASHINGTON, Jan 10 (IPS) - The New York Times reported January 5 that Iran had "quietly hidden an increasingly large part of its atomic complex" in a vast network of tunnels and bunkers buried in mountainsides.

The story continued a narrative begun last September, when a second Iranian uranium enrichment facility near Qom was reported to have been discovered by U.S. and Western intelligence. The premise of that narrative is that Iran wanted secret nuclear facilities in order to be able to make a nuclear weapon without being detected by the international community. <http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=49932>

Q&A: From Simple Anti-War Agenda to Expansive Peace Initiatives

Mutsuko Murakami interviews IKURO ANZAI, honorary director of the Kyoto Museum for World Peace TOKYO, Jan 01 (IPS) - Of approximately 170 peace museums that exist around the world, a third are found in Japan. The Kyoto Museum for World Peace at Ritsumeikan University, located in Kyoto, is the only one in Japan housed in a higher educational institution. It captures the history of the country's aggression as well as its tragic wartime experiences. The private university in Japan's ancient capital was once an active advocate of the country's belligerent behaviour during World War II. <http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=49873>

OTHER LANGUAGES [Translations | Adaptations]

PICKUPS BY WEBSITES

CIVIL SOCIETY'S PERSPECTIVE

WHAT OTHERS SAY

Unified Approach Needed For Nuclear Disarmament

By Jayantha Dhanapala *

KANDY, SRI LANKA, Jan (IPS) The only viable normative approach regarding nuclear weapons is their total and universal elimination under strict verification. This cannot be achieved by incremental steps but only by the negotiation of a Nuclear Weapons Convention as advocated by the UN Secretary-General.

Today, there are some grounds to hope for a reconciliation of the broken marriage between nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Both US President Obama and Russian President Medvedev have repeatedly indicated their support for achieving a world free of nuclear weapons. We may be heading for a new age of deproliferation, a reversal both of the spread of these weapons and of their perpetuation and further improvement.

The concept of nuclear-weapon 'proliferation' has two dimensions: horizontal (geographical spread) and vertical (improvements of existing arsenals). The nuclear-weapon states (NWS), supported by states in NATO and others under the 'nuclear umbrella', have long stressed the importance of preventing the former while promoting the latter.

Here's how it works. The NWS express alarm over the prospect, real or imagined, of new nuclear-weapon states. This leads them to engage in desperate efforts (such as the illegal invasion of Iraq) to prevent this from happening, hence the need for ever-increasing controls against horizontal proliferation.

Yet this contrived foreign threat has a dual-use: it also serves the NWS as grounds for rationalising the improvement ('modernisation') of their nuclear arsenals, and the indefinite postponement of disarmament.

The selective narrative of the NWS has even further obfuscated matters with the conspiracy of silence over the undeclared nuclear-weapon capability of Israel, which some of them have assisted. Moreover, an arbitrary distinction has been drawn between 'good' and 'bad' proliferators. The 1995 Resolution on the Middle East - without which the indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) would not have been achieved- has been ignored.

Thus India, a longstanding holdout of the NPT but a 'good' proliferator, has been rewarded with supplies of technology and material under its nuclear co-operation deal with the US. Likewise the stationing of US nuclear weapons in five European countries despite the objections of the public in some of them is justified as 'nuclear sharing'.

A new dimension is the possible acquisition and use of nuclear weapons by terrorist groups, which, while being frighteningly real, is another form of proliferation that the NWS have seized upon to distract attention from their own nuclear weapons -which, of course, have no conceivable military value in combating terrorism. The fundamental issue is that nuclear weapons are inherently dangerous in anybody's hands.

This upstairs/downstairs division of responsibilities between nuclear have's and have-not's is also pernicious in masking the reality that disarmament and non-proliferation are two faces of the same coin. They have to be mutually-reinforcing parallel processes.

The emergence in the 20th century of nuclear weapons as the most destructive weapon of mass destruction and terror marked a watershed. This weapon proved to be vastly more destructive of human life with long-lasting ecological and genetic effects. Thus the elimination or control of nuclear weapons became the priority of the UN and the international community. >>>

Bilateral treaties between the two largest NWS (US and Russia, which hold an estimated 95 percent of these weapons) and multilateral treaties banning nuclear tests (the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty or CTBT) and proliferation (NPT) have sought to regulate their vertical and horizontal proliferation. So have the nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties forged by non-nuclear weapon states (NNWS). It is estimated by SIPRI (the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute) that today there are more than 23,300 nuclear warheads in the world and that the US, Russia, UK, France, China, India, Pakistan, and Israel have 8,392 deployed warheads ready to be launched within minutes.

The normative structure with regard to all weapons has two aspects. One is to seek universal bans on inhumane weapons or particular categories of weapons for humanitarian and collective security reasons. The other is to seek arms control in terms of levels of arsenals or prevention of new possessors. Disarmament requires verifiable destruction of existing weapons, cessation of production, sale, storage, transfer, or acquisition.

Thus the outlawing (as distinct from limitation or reduction) of biological and chemical weapons, anti-personnel land mines, cluster munitions, laser weapons, and other categories has been achieved globally even though the multilateral treaties negotiated for these purposes may not be universal and their verification is not always reliable.

The one treaty which attempts a combination of disarmament and arms control is the NPT, which is the world's most widely subscribed to disarmament treaty. It openly accepts two categories of state parties -- the NWS and the NNWS.

NWS are obliged, as treaty parties, to negotiate the reduction and elimination of their weapons. NNWS are totally forbidden to acquire such weapons and the International Atomic Energy Agency is empowered to enter into arrangements with them when peaceful uses of nuclear energy are involved.

As far as arms control is concerned, NWS are permitted to retain their weapons with the restraints that apply through other bilateral and multilateral treaties. But instead of fulfilling their obligations under the NPT, the NWS are trying to impose more restrictions on the NNWS in preparation for the May 2010 NPT Review Conference by seeking to limit the Article X right to withdrawal and to impose new conditionalities for the Article IV right to their peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

The discovery of Iraq's clandestine nuclear weapon programme in the early 1990s; the withdrawal of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from the NPT and its subsequent nuclear weapon tests; the acknowledgment and rectification of Libya's non-compliance; the persisting questions about a reported Syrian nuclear reactor destroyed by Israel; and the continuing tensions over Iran's nuclear programme have certainly weakened the NPT as a non-proliferation instrument.

At this juncture, only a reunification of the disarmament and the non-proliferation approach can save the treaty. – © COPYRIGHT IPS ■

* Jayantha Dhanapala, former Ambassador of Sri Lanka, presided over the 1995 NPT Review & Extension Conference. He was UN Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs from 1998-2003 and is currently President of the Pugwash Conferences on Science & World Affairs. These are his personal views.

Iran Uses Fear of Covert Nuclear Sites to Deter Attack

Analysis by Gareth Porter*

WASHINGTON, Jan 10 (IPS) - The New York Times reported January 5 that Iran had "quietly hidden an increasingly large part of its atomic complex" in a vast network of tunnels and bunkers buried in mountainsides.

The story continued a narrative begun last September, when a second Iranian uranium enrichment facility near Qom was reported to have been discovered by U.S. and Western intelligence. The premise of that narrative is that Iran wanted secret nuclear facilities in order to be able to make a nuclear weapon without being detected by the international community.

But all the evidence indicates that the real story is exactly the opposite: far from wanting to hide the existence of nuclear facilities from the outside world, Iran has wanted Western intelligence to conclude that it was putting some of its key nuclear facilities deep underground for more than three years.

The reason for that surprising conclusion is simple: Iran's primary problem in regard to its nuclear programme has been how to deter a U.S. or Israeli attack on its nuclear sites. To do that, Iranian officials believed they needed to convince U.S. and Israeli military planners that they wouldn't be able to destroy some of Iran's nuclear sites and couldn't identify others.

The key to unraveling the confusion surrounding the Qom facility and the system of tunnel complexes is the fact that Iran knew the site at Qom was being closely watched by U.S. and other intelligence agencies both through satellite photographs and spy networks on the ground well before construction of the facility began.

The National Council of Resistance in Iran (NCRI), the political arm of the Mujahideen E Khalq anti-regime terrorist organisation, held a press conference on Dec. 20, 2005, in which it charged that four underground tunnel complexes were connected with Iran's nuclear programme, including one near Qom.

NCRI had created very strong international pressure on Iran's nuclear programme by revealing the existence of the Natanz enrichment facility in an August 2002 press conference. A number of its charges had been referred to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for investigation.

It is now clear that there was nothing in the tunnel complex at Qom related to the nuclear programme when the NCRI made that charge.

Given the close ties between the MEK and both the U.S. and Israel, however, Iran's decision makers had to be well aware that foreign intelligence agencies would focus their surveillance in Iran on the tunnel complexes that the MEK had identified.

U.S. and European officials have confirmed that systematic surveillance of the site by satellite photography began in 2006. What happened next is a particularly important clue to Iran's strategy. According to multiple sources, an anti-aircraft battery was moved to the base of the mountain into which the tunnel complex had been dug. That was a clear indication that Iranian officials not only knew the site was under surveillance but wanted to draw attention to it.

That move prompted serious debate within the intelligence community. French security consultant Roland Jacquard, who had contacts in the intelligence community, recalled to Time magazine last October that some analysts suggested that it could be a "decoy", aimed at fixing intelligence attention on that site, while the real nuclear facilities were being built elsewhere. >>>

If Iran had believed the site was not under surveillance, there would have been no reason to move an anti-aircraft battery to it.

That anti-aircraft battery was evidently intended to ensure that foreign intelligence would be watching as construction of a new facility continued at Qom. Satellite imagery that has been obtained by the Institute for Science and International Security in Washington, D.C. shows that construction of the facility began sometime between mid-2006 and mid-2007, according to satellite imagery interpretation specialist Paul Brannan of the ISIS.

Of course intelligence analysts could not be certain of the site's precise purpose until a later stage of construction. A senior U.S. intelligence official revealed in the Sep. 25 briefing that the analysts were not confident that it was indeed an enrichment facility until sometime in spring 2009.

Meanwhile, the Iranians were providing foreign intelligence agencies with clear evidence it would use a "passive defence strategy" to protect its nuclear facilities. In a statement on Iranian television Sept. 24, 2007, the Chairman of the Passive Defence Organisation, Gholam Reza Jalali, said the strategy would "conceal and protect the country's important and sensitive facilities, [which] would minimise their vulnerability..."

Jalali revealed to Mehr news agency Aug. 24, 2007 that a nuclear installation monitored by the IAEA was part of the plan. As the New York Times reported January 5, tunnels have been built into mountains near the Isfahan uranium conversion complex.

News media have consistently reported that Iran informed the IAEA about the Qom facility in a letter Sep. 21 only because the site had been discovered by Western intelligence.

But a set of Questions and Answers issued by the Barack Obama administration the same day as the press briefing admitted, "We do not know" in answer to the question, "Why did the Iranians decide to reveal this facility at this time?"

In fact, Iran's Sep. 21 letter to the IAEA, an excerpt of which was published in the Nov. 16 IAEA report, appears to have been part of the strategy of confusing U.S. and Israeli war planners. It stated that the construction of a second enrichment facility had been "based on [its] sovereign right of safeguarding...sensitive nuclear facilities through various means such as utilization of passive defense systems..."

As Time magazine's John Barry noted in an Oct. 2 story, the letter was read by intelligence analysts as suggesting that among the more than a dozen tunnel sites being closely monitored were more undisclosed nuclear sites.

A few days later, the Iranian daily Kayhan, which is very close to President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, said the announcement of the site had helped to foil plans for a military strike by the West, because "the multiplicity of facilities is a very effective defensive action".

That statement hinted that Iran was able to complicate the task of U.S. and Israeli military planners by introducing uncertainty about where additional nuclear facilities might be hidden.

The New York Times article on Iran's tunnel complex indicates that Iran's strategy has succeeded in influencing on debates in Israel and the United States over the feasibility of a devastating blow to the Iranian nuclear programme. The Times called the tunneling system "a cloak of invisibility" that is "complicating the West's military and geopolitical calculus".

It said some analysts consider Iran's "passive defense" strategy "a crucial factor" in the Obama administration's insistence on a non-military solution. >>>

One indication of that the Iranian strategy has had an impact on Israeli calculations is that Maj. Gen. Aharon Ze'evi Farkash, the head of intelligence for the Israeli Defense Force (IDF) from 2002 to 2006, supported an attack on Iran by the U.S. Air Force – a standard Israeli position - at a meeting at the pro-Israel Washington Institute for Near East Policy last October.

But Farkash warned that Western intelligence still may not know about all of Iran's nuclear sites. In other statements, Farkash has opposed an Israeli strike. ■

*Gareth Porter is an investigative historian and journalist specialising in U.S. national security policy. The paperback edition of his latest book, "Perils of Dominance: Imbalance of Power and the Road to War in Vietnam", was published in 2006.

Q&A: From Simple Anti-War Agenda to Expansive Peace Initiatives

**Mutsuko Murakami interviews IKURO ANZAI, honorary director of the
Kyoto Museum for World Peace**

TOKYO, Jan 1 (IPS) - Of approximately 170 peace museums that exist around the world, a third are found in Japan.

The Kyoto Museum for World Peace at Ritsumeikan University, located in Kyoto, is the only one in Japan housed in a higher educational institution. It captures the history of the country's aggression as well as its tragic wartime experiences. The private university in Japan's ancient capital was once an active advocate of the country's belligerent behaviour during World War II.

In 1992 the university founded the Museum as part of its commitment to peace building. The Kyoto Museum has attracted more than 900,000 visitors.

Today, it is widely known for its active peace education campaigns and collaborative programmes at home and across borders.

Considered a major force behind the Kyoto Museum is Dr Ikuro Anzai, who is also its first director. A trained physicist, he taught at a medical school before he was invited to teach international affairs at Ritsumeikan in 1986.

Dr Anzai has since gained recognition as a leading scholar on peace studies. He now serves as director emeritus of the Nanjing Research Institute for International Peace at Nanjing University, China, which aims to gather historical documents on the atrocities committed by Japan during its occupation of China's ancient capital in December 1937.

In 2008, the Museum hosted the 6th International Conference of Museums for Peace, which drew over 5,000 participants from more than 50 countries. Dr Anzai was a key mover in making the event possible. The first such conference was convened in 1992 at Bradford, England, giving rise to the International Network of Museums for Peace (INMP), where he sits on the executive board.

The INMP plans to have the next international conference in 2010 in Barcelona, to be followed by another one two years later in The Hague.

In an interview with IPS, Prof Anzai discusses the important role of peace museums in the global peace efforts as well as the prospects and challenges involved. ➤➤➤



Prof Ikuro Anzai: "Peace is not just the absence of war."
Credit: Ritsumeikan University

Q: Why does Japan have so many peace museums?

A: Our country's aggressive pursuit of war left so many scars, not to mention memorial items to exhibit. Because of the war and partly because of the (Japanese) people's tragic experiences of nuclear attacks [referring to the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki], people developed a strong urge to pursue peace.

In 1978 the Japanese collected 30 million signatures for the first Special Session on Disarmament of the United Nations General Assembly. They have been a major force calling on local (prefectural) governments and cities to declare a nuclear-free status or build peace museums in cities and towns. Civil society in Japan has indeed demonstrated its capacity for peace building.

Q: You say peace museums can do more than document and depict historical facts on wars and their consequent human sufferings. What role do peace museums play in this regard?

A: To promote "peace literacy" and contribute more effectively to peace building in the world, museums can organise lectures, film showings, research efforts, tours, peace conferences and touring exhibits, among others. We can build a network of such museums and support each other for the common cause, too.

Some peace museums in Japan are already sharing exhibit items among themselves and jointly organising new programmes. We have invited officials and curators of other Asian museums outside Japan to exchange experiences and ideas. Together we can do a lot more than the "cobweb"-style exhibits, where we only wait for people to come.

Q: What other factors steered peace museums in this new direction?

A: We have seen the evolution of the concept of peace since Dr. Johan Galtung – the Norwegian scholar and founder of peace studies – redefined it during the 1970s.

Peace is not just the absence of war, he says, but also of any form of violence, deprivation of human rights, environmental exploitation or cultural violence. We have shifted our emphasis at our museum from simple anti-war agenda to expansive peace studies. Some other peace museums have also adjusted to adopt this new definition of peace.

Q: What did the 2008 International Conference of Museums for Peace accomplish? What is the next step? A: In addition to the success of the conference itself, it led us to build a framework for its organising body, the INMP. We have made it a legal institution, created its constitution, appointed officials, built its membership system and set up the administrative office in The Hague.

Prof Peter van den Dungen of Peace Studies at the University of Bradford (in Britain) acts as its general coordinator. Such institutionalising process provides us with a solid base for further development in the future. Through the INMP, we can strengthen our unity, expand our peace studies in collaboration (with similar institutions) and help new museums to be launched.

Q: You have established strong ties with the Nanjing Massacre Museum, which shows the gross injustice committed by the Japanese military in China in 1937. Has there been any progress in the reconciliatory process between China and Japan through efforts like yours?

A: Although the Nanjing Massacre Museum (the largest museum of its kind in the world) depicts massacre and human sufferings, it now also emphasises "peace creation." It is significant to note that they appointed me – a Japanese – as director emeritus at its Research Institute for international peace. >>>

We will continue our endeavors toward true reconciliation. Someday I hope we can exchange exhibits with the Nanjing Massacre Museum and Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum.

Q: What are the next challenges for you?

A: I would like to see our museum expand into a new peace museum complex, comprising three new museums. One will be a Science and Technology Museum for Peace at our university's Lake Biwa Campus; the second, an International Understanding Museum for Peace at Ritsumeikan Asia-Pacific University in Oita Prefecture down south; and thirdly, a Digital Resource Museum for Peace Education at the university-affiliated primary, junior and senior high schools.

Internationally, I expect the INMP to develop further all the way to the 2012 conference in The Hague. It will be an epoch-making event paving the way for our people to play active roles in the decade that will follow. ■

OTHER LANGUAGES [Translations | Adaptations]

French

DESARMEMENT:

Une approche unifiée nécessaire pour le désarmement nucléaire

Jayantha Dhanapala*

KANDY, Sri Lanka, 6 fév (IPS) - La seule approche normative viable concernant les armes nucléaires est leur élimination totale et universelle sous une vérification stricte. Ceci ne peut pas être réalisé par étapes successives, mais seulement par la négociation d'une Convention sur les armes nucléaires comme le préconise le secrétaire général de l'ONU.

Aujourd'hui, il y a des raisons d'espérer une réconciliation du mariage rompu entre le désarmement nucléaire et la non-prolifération. Le président américain, Obama, et le président russe, Medvedev, ont indiqué à plusieurs reprises leur soutien à la réalisation d'un monde exempt d'armes nucléaires. Nous pourrions être en train de nous diriger vers un nouvel âge de la dé-prolifération, un renversement à la fois de la propagation de ces armes, de leur perpétuation et de leur amélioration plus approfondie.

Le concept de la 'prolifération' des armes nucléaires a deux dimensions: horizontale (répartition géographique) et verticale (améliorations des arsenaux existants). Les Etats dotés d'armes nucléaires (EDAN), soutenus par les Etats au sein de l'Organisation du traité de l'Atlantique nord (OTAN) et d'autres sous le 'parapluie nucléaire', ont longtemps souligné l'importance de la prévention de la première dimension tout en promouvant la dernière.

Voici comment cela fonctionne. Les EDAN préviennent sur la perspective, réelle ou imaginaire, de nouveaux Etats dotés d'armes nucléaires. Ceci les amène à s'engager dans des efforts désespérés (tels que l'invasion illégale de l'Irak) pour empêcher que cela se produise, d'où la nécessité des contrôles de plus en plus croissants de la prolifération horizontale.

Pourtant, cette menace étrangère forcée a un double usage: elle sert aussi aux EDAN comme des raisons de rationaliser l'amélioration ('modernisation') de leurs arsenaux nucléaires, et le report illimité du désarmement.

Le récit sélectif des EDAN a même davantage obscurci des questions liées au complot de silence sur la capacité non déclarée de l'armement nucléaire d'Israël, que certains d'entre eux ont aidé. En outre, une distinction arbitraire a été établie entre les 'bons' et les 'mauvais' proliférateurs. La résolution 1995 sur le Moyen-Orient - sans laquelle la prorogation indéfinie du Traité de non-prolifération nucléaire (TNP) n'aurait pas été atteinte - a été ignorée. >>>

OTHER LANGUAGES [Translations | Adaptations]

Ainsi, l'Inde, un obstacle de longue date au TNP, mais un 'bon' proliférateur, a été récompensée avec des approvisionnements de la technologie et des matériels conformément à son accord de coopération nucléaire avec les Etats-Unis. De même, le stationnement d'armes nucléaires américaines dans cinq pays européens, malgré les objections du public dans certains d'entre eux, est justifié comme un 'partage nucléaire'.

Une nouvelle dimension est l'acquisition et l'utilisation éventuelle d'armes nucléaires par des groupes terroristes, qui, tout en étant dangereusement réels, constituent une autre forme de prolifération sur laquelle les EDAN ont sauté pour détourner l'attention de leurs propres armes nucléaires – qui, bien entendu, n'ont aucune valeur militaire concevable dans la lutte contre le terrorisme. La question fondamentale est que les armes nucléaires sont intrinsèquement dangereuses dans les mains de n'importe qui.

Cette division par le haut et le bas des responsabilités entre les pays possédant le nucléaire et ceux qui n'en ont pas, est également pernicieuse pour masquer la réalité que le désarmement et la non-prolifération sont deux faces d'une même médaille. Ils doivent être des processus parallèles de renforcement mutuel.

L'apparition au 20ème siècle des armes nucléaires comme étant la plus grande arme de destruction massive et de terreur a marqué un point décisif. Cette arme s'est révélée être extrêmement plus destructrice de la vie humaine avec des effets écologiques et génétiques durables. Ainsi, l'élimination ou le contrôle des armes nucléaires est devenue la priorité de l'ONU et de la communauté internationale.

Les traités bilatéraux entre les deux plus grands EDAN (les Etats-Unis et la Russie, qui détiennent environ 95 pour cent de ces armes) et les traités multilatéraux sur l'interdiction des essais nucléaires (le Traité d'interdiction complète des essais nucléaires ou TICEN) et la prolifération (TNP) ont cherché à réguler leur prolifération verticale et horizontale.

Alors, que les traités sur les zones exemptes d'armes nucléaires soient élaborés par des Etats non dotés d'armes nucléaires (ENDAN). Le SIPRI (Institut international de recherche sur la paix de Stockholm) estime qu'il y a aujourd'hui plus de 23.300 ogives nucléaires dans le monde et que les Etats-Unis, la Russie, la Grande-Bretagne, la France, la Chine, l'Inde, le Pakistan et Israël ont 8.392 ogives déployées prêtes à être lancées en quelques minutes.

La structure normative, par rapport à toutes les armes, a deux aspects. L'un consiste à rechercher des interdictions universelles sur les armes inhumaines ou des catégories d'armes particulières pour des raisons de sécurité humanitaire et collective. L'autre est de rechercher le contrôle des armes en termes des niveaux d'arsenaux ou de la prévention de nouveaux possesseurs. Le désarmement exige la destruction vérifiable des armes existantes, la cessation de la production, de la vente, du stockage, du transfert, ou de l'acquisition.

Ainsi, la proscription (par opposition à la limitation ou la réduction) des armes biologiques et chimiques, des mines terrestres antipersonnel, des munitions à fragmentation, des armes au laser, et d'autres catégories, a été atteinte au niveau mondial, bien que les traités multilatéraux négociés à ces fins ne puissent pas être universels et que leur vérification ne soit pas toujours fiable.

Le seul traité qui tente une combinaison du désarmement et du contrôle des armes est le TNP, qui est le traité de désarmement le plus largement signé. Il accepte ouvertement deux catégories d'Etat parties - les EDAN et les ENDAN.

Les EDAN sont tenus, en tant que parties au traité, de négocier la réduction et l'élimination de leurs armes. Il est totalement interdit aux ENDAN d'acquérir de telles armes et l'Agence internationale de l'énergie atomique est habilitée à conclure des accords avec eux lorsque des utilisations pacifiques de l'énergie nucléaire sont impliquées. >>>

OTHER LANGUAGES [Translations | Adaptations]

Concernant le contrôle des armes, les EDAN sont autorisés à garder leurs armes avec les restrictions qui s'appliquent à travers d'autres traités bilatéraux et multilatéraux. Mais au lieu de respecter leurs obligations conformément au TNP, les EDAN essaient d'imposer plus de restrictions aux ENDAN, en préparation de la Conférence de révision du TNP en mai 2010, en cherchant à limiter le droit de l'article X à retirer et à imposer de nouvelles conditionnalités pour le droit de l'article IV à leurs utilisations pacifiques de l'énergie nucléaire.

La découverte du programme clandestin de l'armement nucléaire de l'Irak au début des années 1990, le retrait de la République populaire démocratique de Corée du TNP et de ses essais d'armes nucléaires subséquents, la reconnaissance et la rectification de la non-conformité de la Libye, les questions persistantes sur un soi-disant réacteur nucléaire syrien détruit par Israël; et les tensions constantes sur le programme nucléaire de l'Iran ont certainement affaibli le TNP en tant qu'un instrument de non-prolifération.

Dans ces circonstances, seule une réunification des approches au désarmement et à la non-prolifération peut sauver le traité. ■

*(Jayantha Dhanapala, ancien ambassadeur du Sri Lanka, a présidé la Conférence de 1995 sur l'examen et l'extension du TNP. Il était sous-secrétaire général de l'ONU pour les affaires de désarmement de 1998 à 2003 et est actuellement président des Conférences de Pugwash sur la science et les affaires mondiales. Tels sont ses points de vue personnels).

Italian

Disarmo nucleare e non proliferazione, due facce della stessa medaglia

Jayantha Dhanapala *

KANDY, SRI LANKA, 4 febbraio (IPS) - L'unico approccio normativo possibile sul tema delle armi nucleari è una loro eliminazione totale e universale, strettamente monitorata: un processo che non può essere condotto in modo graduale, ma solo negoziando una Convenzione sulle armi nucleari, come raccomandato dal Segretario generale delle Nazioni Unite.

Oggi ci sono speranze di riconciliazione dopo il matrimonio fallito tra disarmo nucleare e non proliferazione. Sia il presidente Usa Barack Obama che quello russo Dimitri Medvedev hanno ribadito il loro appoggio all'ideale di un mondo libero dalle armi nucleari. Forse ci stiamo avviando verso una nuova era di "de-proliferazione", verso un'inversione di rotta sia per quanto riguarda la diffusione degli armamenti che rispetto al loro perpetuarsi e alla loro continua crescita.

Il concetto di "proliferazione" delle armi nucleari ha due diverse dimensioni: orizzontale (diffusione geografica) e verticale (miglioramento degli arsenali già esistenti). Gli stati dotati di armi nucleari (NWS, dall'acronimo inglese), sostenuti dai paesi Nato e da altri stati, da tempo sottolineano l'importanza di impedire la prima dimensione, ma al contempo continuano a sostenere la seconda.

Ecco come funziona. Gli NWS si dicono allarmati per la possibilità, reale o immaginaria, della comparsa di nuovi stati nucleari. Quindi, si impegnano in sforzi disperati (come l'invasione illegale dell'Iraq) per impedire che ciò accada, e intensificano i controlli contro la proliferazione orizzontale. Questa artificiosa minaccia esterna serve agli NWS per "modernizzare" i propri arsenali nucleari, rinviando a tempo indefinito il disarmo.

Una nuova dimensione è il possibile accesso alle armi nucleari da parte dei gruppi terroristici. Pur essendo una minaccia terribilmente reale, è un'altra forma di proliferazione che gli NWS hanno usato per distogliere l'attenzione dalle armi nucleari in loro possesso che, ovviamente, non hanno valore militare nella lotta contro il terrorismo. Il tema fondamentale è che le armi nucleari sono in sostanza pericolose nelle mani di chiunque.

➤➤➤

OTHER LANGUAGES [Translations | Adaptations]

Questa divisione di responsabilità tra stati non dotati e stati dotati di armi nucleari è dannosa anche perché maschera una realtà in cui disarmo e non proliferazione sono due facce della stessa medaglia. Devono essere processi paralleli che si rafforzano a vicenda.

La comparsa di armi nucleari nel XX secolo, armi di distruzione di massa più devastanti e terribili che mai, con effetti ecologici e genetici di vastissima portata, ha segnato un punto di svolta per l'umanità. Da qui, la loro eliminazione o controllo è diventata una priorità per l'Onu e la comunità internazionale.

I trattati bilaterali tra i due principali NWS (Usa e Russia, dotati secondo le stime del 95 per cento di queste armi) e i trattati multilaterali che proibiscono i test nucleari (come il Trattato per il divieto assoluto di test nucleari, CTBT) e la proliferazione (Trattato di non proliferazione nucleare, TNP), sono intesi a regolamentare la loro proliferazione verticale e orizzontale, così come i trattati sulle zone libere da armi nucleari sottoscritti dagli stati non dotati di armi nucleari (NNWS).

Secondo il SIPRI (Stockholm International Peace Research Institute), oggi ci sarebbero oltre 23.300 testate nucleari al mondo, mentre Usa, Russia, Gran Bretagna, Francia, Cina, India, Pakistan e Israele deterrebbero nell'insieme 8.392 testate pronte per essere lanciate nel giro di pochi minuti.

La struttura normativa su ogni tipo di arma ha due aspetti diversi: il primo, cercare di imporre una forma di divieto universale per le armi disumane o che rappresentino una minaccia per la sicurezza collettiva; il secondo, una forma di controllo in termini quantitativi, per evitare la comparsa di nuovi detentori.

Grazie a diversi trattati multilaterali, si è riuscito a dichiarare illegali a livello mondiale le armi chimiche o biologiche, le mine terrestri antiuomo, le munizioni a grappolo, armi laser e altre categorie, anche se la loro effettiva attuazione non sempre è verificabile.

L'unico trattato che cerca di unire disarmo e controllo di armi è il TNP, l'accordo sul disarmo più sottoscritto al mondo. Accetta apertamente due categorie di stati firmatari, gli NWS e NNWS.

Gli NWS sono obbligati, in quanto firmatari del trattato, a negoziare la riduzione e l'eliminazione delle proprie armi. Per gli NNWS è invece totalmente proibito acquisire tali armi. L'Agenzia internazionale per l'energia atomica (AIEA) è autorizzata ad intervenire nei casi di uso pacifico di energia nucleare.

Quanto al tema del controllo, agli NWS viene concesso di mantenere le proprie armi, seppure con le restrizioni stabilite in altri trattati. Ma invece di adempiere ai propri obblighi previsti dal TNP, questi paesi cercano di imporre maggiori restrizioni agli NNWS, come limitare il loro diritto di ritirarsi dal trattato e pretendere nuove condizioni sull'uso pacifico dell'energia nucleare.

La scoperta del programma clandestino di produzione di armi nucleari in Iraq all'inizio degli anni '90; il ritiro della Corea del Nord dal TNP e i suoi successivi test nucleari; il riconoscimento e rettifica dell'inosservanza della Libia; i forti dubbi su un presunto reattore nucleare della Siria distrutto da Israele e le continue tensioni sul programma nucleare dell'Iran, hanno certamente indebolito il TNP come strumento di non proliferazione.

In questo panorama, solo unificando gli approcci sul disarmo e la non proliferazione il trattato potrà essere salvato. © IPS ■

* Le opinioni espresse in questo articolo rappresentano unicamente il parere dell'autore.

OTHER LANGUAGES [Translations | Adaptations] Turkish

Nükleer Silahsızlanma İçin İşbirliği Gerekli

Jayantha Dhanapala

KANDY, SRI LANKA, Ocak (IPS) - Nükleer silahların tüm dünyada ve kanıtlanabilir şekilde tamamen ortadan kaldırılması elimizde bulunan tek anlamlı seçenek. Bu sonuca ulaşmak için aşamalı şekilde ilerlemek yerine BM Genel Sekreteri'nin önerdiği gibi Nükleer Silah Anlaşması çerçevesinde yapılacak müzakereler yürütülmeli.

Bugün nükleer silahsızlanma ve yaygınlaşmasını önlemek üzere oluşturulan anlaşma arasındaki aksaklığı gidermek için umut doğmuş durumda. Hem ABD başkanı Obama hem de Rusya başkanı Medvedev nükleer silahlardan arındırılmış bir dünya fikrine desteklerini açıkladı. Silahların yayılmasının ve geliştirilmesinin önlenmesi açısından yeni bir döneme giriyor olabiliriz.

Nükleer silahsızlanmanın iki boyutu var: Birincisi yatay, coğrafi olarak yaygınlığı önlemek; diğeri de dikey, var olan cephanelerin geliştirilmesini önlemek. NATO'nun desteklediği nükleer silah sahibi devletler ve "nükleer şemsiye" altında bulunan diğerleri uzun zamandır ilk boyutu öne çıkarırken ikincisini geriye atıyor.

İşler şöyle yürüyor: Nükleer silah sahibi devletler, nükleer silaha sahip ya da sahip olma potansiyeli bulunan yeni devletler konusunda endişelerini belirtiyor. Bu durumu önlemek için –Irak'ın yasa dışı işgali gibi- umutsuz çabalara girişiyor ve yatay yaygınlaşmaya karşı daha da fazla denetim ihtiyacı ortaya çıkarıyorlar.

Fakat bu yabancı tehdit algısı iki şekilde işlev görüyor: hem nükleer silaha sahip devletlerin kendi nükleer cephanelerini geliştirmelerine meşruiyet sağlıyor, hem de nükleer silahsızlanma fikrini sonsuza kadar erteliyor.

Bu devletlerin seçici söylemi, bazılarının da gelişmesine yardım ettiği İsrail'in açıklanmayan nükleer silah potansiyeli konusunda süren sessizlik nedeniyle daha da karmaşık bir hale geliyor. Dahası, "iyi" ve "kötü"ler olarak ayırım yapılıyor. Orta Doğu üzerine 1995'te – Nükleer Silahsızlanma Anlaşması'nın sınırsız olarak yaygınlaşması sayesinde- alınan karar göz ardı ediliyor.

Dolayısıyla, anlaşmaya uzun zaman dirense de "iyi" bir silah sahibi olan Hindistan, ABD'yle yaptığı işbirliği anlaşması çerçevesinde teknoloji ve kaynak aktarımıyla ödüllendiriliyor. Benzer şekilde, halkların itirazlarına rağmen beş Avrupa ülkesine AD nükleer silahlarının yerleştirilmesi de "nükleer paylaşım" diye meşrulaştırılıyor.

Yeni bir boyut da terörist grupların nükleer silah edinmesi. Korkutucu derecede gerçek bir olasılık olsa da, bu da silah sahibi devletlerin ilgiyi –terörizmle mücadelede hiçbir askeri anlamı olmayan- kendi nükleer silahlarından kaçırarak ve nükleer silahsızlanmayı geriye atmak için kullandığı bir olanak oluyor. Temel sorun nükleer silahları kimin elinde olduğundan bağımsız olarak tehlike arz etmesi.

Nükleer sahipleri ve diğerleri arasında kurulan bu eşitsiz sorumluluk dengesi aynı zamanda nükleer silahsızlanma ve nükleer silahların yaygınlaşmasının önlenmesinin aynı resmin iki yüzü olduğu gerçeğini de gizliyor. Bu ikisi paralel olarak yürütülecek süreçler.

20. yüzyılda nükleerin yok etme gücü en yüksek kitle imha ve terör silahı olarak ortaya çıkması bir sınır çizdi. Uzun erimli ekolojik ve genetik etkileriyle bu silah insan hayatı üzerinde geniş bir yok ediciliğe sahip. Dolayısıyla nükleer silahların ortadan kaldırılması ve kontrolü BM ve uluslararası toplumun önceliği haline geldi. >>>

OTHER LANGUAGES [Translations | Adaptations]

Nükleer silah sahibi iki en büyük devlet –tüm nükleer silahların yüzde 95'ine sahip olan ABD ve Rusya- arasındaki ikili anlaşmalar ve nükleer denemeleri ve yaygınlaştırmayı yasaklayan çok taraflı anlaşmalar dikey ve yatay silahlanmayı düzenlemeyi amaçladı. Nükleer silahsız devletlerin nükleersiz alan anlaşmaları da aynı amaca hizmet etti. Stockholm Uluslararası Barış Araştırmaları Enstitüsü'nün (SIPRI) tahminlerine göre bugün dünyada 23 bin 300'den fazla nükleer silah başlığı var ve ABD, Rusya, Britanya, Fransa, Çin, Hindistan, Pakistan ve İsrail birkaç dakika içinde fırlatılabilecek 8 bin 392 savaş başlığını hazır tutuyor.

Tüm silahlara yönelik yapılanmanın iki boyutu var: Birincisi insanlık dışı ve insanlığın kolektif güvenliği açısından bazı silah kategorilerini evrensel olarak yasaklamak. Diğer de cephane düzeyinde ve yeni sahiplerin oluşmasını kontrol etmek. Silahsızlanma için var olan silahların kanıtlanabilir şekilde ortadan kaldırılması, üretimin, satışın, depolamanın, transferin ve silah ediniminin durması gerekiyor.

Dolayısıyla biyolojik ve kimyasal silahları, kara mayınlarını, msket bombalarını, lazer silahlarını ve diğer kategorileri (sınırlamak veya azaltmaktan farklı olarak) yasaklamak konusunda, bunun için oluşturulan anlaşmalar evrensel ölçekte kabul görmese ya da her zaman etkin olmasa da, evrensel ölçekte bir uzlaşma sağlandı.

Dünyadaki en geniş kabul gören ve silahsızlanmayı silah kontrolüyle birleştiren tek anlaşma NPT. Açıkça silah sahibi ve silah sahibi olmayan devletler diye iki kategori belirliyor.

Silah sahipleri, anlaşmanın tarafları olarak, ellerindeki silahları azaltma ve ortadan kaldırma sorumluluğunu yükleniyor. Silah sahibi olmayanlar da silah edinmekten men ediliyor ve Uluslararası Atom Enerjisi Kurumu da nükleerin barışçıl kullanımı için onlarla işbirliği yapmakla yetkilendiriliyor.

Silah kontrolüyle ilgili olarak da nükleer silah sahibi devletler, diğer ikili anlaşmalarla belirlenen oranlarda silahlarını tutma iznine sahip. Fakat anlaşmayla verilen sorumluluklarını yerine getirmek yerine bu devletler Mayıs 2010'da açıklanacak değerlendirme raporunda silah sahibi olmayan devletlere daha fazla kısıtlama getirmek için çabalıyor.

1990'larda Irak'ın gizli nükleer programının ortaya çıkması, Kuzey Kore'nin anlaşmadan çekilmesi ve ardından nükleer denemelere girişmesi, Libya'nın anlaşmaya uymadığının belirlenmesi, İsrail'in yok ettiği söylenen Suriye'deki nükleer tesisle ilgili havada duran sorular ve İran'ın nükleer programıyla ilgili süre giden gerilim NPT'nin bir anlaşma olarak zayıflamasına yol açtı.

Bu dönemde ancak silahsızlanma konusunda işbirliği ve yeniden ortaya çıkacak bir ortaklaşma anlaşmayı kadük olmaktan kurtarabilir. ■

(*) Sri Lanka'nın eski büyükelçisi Jayantha Dhanapala, 1995 NPT değerlendirme ve genişletme konferansına başkanlık yaptı. 1998-2003 arasında BM'de silahsızlanma konularında genel sekreter yardımcılığını yürüttü ve halen Bilim ve Dünya Üzerine Pugwash Konferansları'nın başkanı. Yazı kendi fikirlerini yansıtmaktadır.

OTHER LANGUAGES [Translations | Adaptations]

Turkish

SİYASET:

İran Gizli Nükleer Tesis Korkusunu Saldırı Tehdidine Karşı Kullanıyor

Gareth Porter'in analizi

WASHINGTON, 10 Ocak 2010 (IPS) - New York Times salı günü yayınladığı haberde İran'ın "nükleer yapılanmasının artan oranda büyük kısmını sessiz bir biçimde" dağ yamaçlarında yer alan tünel ve sığınaklara taşıdığını yazdı.

Haber, geçen eylül ayında Kum kentinde yer alan ikinci bir uranyum zenginleştirme tesisinin ABD ve Batılı istihbaratçılar tarafından keşfedildiği yönünde çıkan raporların arkasını getiriyor. Bu hikayenin ardında yatan iddia İran'ın uluslararası toplum tarafından fark edilmeden gizli nükleer tesislere sahip olmak istediği.

Fakat tüm veriler gerçeklerin tam ters istikamette olduğunu gösteriyor: nükleer tesislerini dış dünyadan gizlemek bir yana, İran üç yıldan beri Batılı istihbaratçıları gizli nükleer tesislere sahip olduğuna kanaat getirmesi için çalışıyor.

Bu sürpriz sonucun arkasında yatan mantık basit: İran'ın yürüttüğü nükleer programla ilgili öncelikli sorunu ABD ve İsrail'in nükleer tesislerine yönelik bir saldırısını önlemek. Bunu yapabilmek için İranlı yetkililer ABD ve İsrail ordusunu nükleer tesislerini yok edemeyeceğine ya da bazılarını bulamayacağına ikna etmeleri gerektiğini düşündüler.

Kum'daki tesisler ve gizli tünel sistemi üzerindeki kafa karışıklığını ortadan kaldırmanın yolu, İran'ın bu tesislerin ABD ve diğer istihbarat servisleri tarafından daha inşaat başlamadan önce uydu fotoğrafları ve sahadaki casus ağlarınca izlendiğini bildiği gerçeğinden geçiyor.

Rejim karşıtı silahlı Halkın Mücahitleri örgütünün siyasi kanadı olan Ulusal Direniş Konseyi (NCRI), 20 Aralık 2005'te düzenlediği basın toplantısında dört yer altı tünel sisteminin, Kum'daki da dahil olmak üzere İran nükleer programıyla bağlantılı olduğunu söylemişti. NCRI, Ağustos 2002'de Natanz'daki uranyum zenginleştirme tesisinin varlığını açıkladığı basın toplantısıyla İran üzerinde uluslar arası baskının yoğunlaşmasını sağlamıştı. Bu açıklamaların bir kısmı araştırması için Uluslararası Atom Enerjisi Kurumu'na (IAEA) iletilmişti.

Şimdi ortaya çıktığına göre, NCRI açıklamayı yaptığında Kum'daki tünellerde İran'ın nükleer programına ait hiçbir şey yoktu.

Bununla birlikte, Halkın Mücahitleri'yle ABD ve İsrail arasındaki sıkı ilişki göz önüne alındığında, İranlı yetkililerin yabancı istihbarat örgütlerinin mücahitler tarafından işaret edilen yerlere odaklanacağını kestirmiş olması gerekir. ABD'li ve Avrupalı yetkililer Kum bölgesinin 2006'dan bu yana uydu fotoğraflarından takip edildiğini doğruladı.

Ardından yaşana gelişmelerse İran'ın siyasetine dair önemli ipuçları veriyor. Farklı kaynaklara göre, tünellerin açıldığı dağın eteğine bir uçaksavar füze bataryası yerleştirildi. Bu, İranlı yetkililerin sadece bölgenin izlendiğinden emin olmadığını, oraya dikkat çekmek istediğini de gösteriyor.

Bu gelime istihbarat topluluğu içinde ciddi tartışmalara yol açtı. Bu grupla ilişkisi olan Fransız güvenlik danışmanı Roland Jacquard geçen kasımda Time dergisine verdiği röportajda bazı analistlerin bunun, gerçek nükleer çalışmalar başka tarafta devam ederken Kum'a ilgi çekecek bir tuzak olabileceğini söylediğini hatırlattı.

➤➤➤

OTHER LANGUAGES [Translations | Adaptations]

Turkish

Eğer İran bölgenin izlendiğini düşünmeseydi, oraya bir uçaksavar bataryası yerleştirmesi için bir neden olmazdı. Bu batarya açıkçası Kum'da devam eden inşaatın yabancı istihbaratçılar tarafından izlenmeye devam etmesini garantilemek içindi. Washington'daki Bilim ve Uluslar arası Güvenlik Enstitüsü'nün ele geçirdiği uydu görüntüleri Kum'daki tesisin inşaatının 2006 ortalarıyla 2007 ortaları arasında başladığını gösteriyor.

Tabii ki istihbarat analistleri inşaat ileri bir safhaya erişmeden ne amaçla kullanılacağını tam olarak bilemiyor. 25 Eylül'de bir açıklama yapan üst düzey bir ABD'li istihbarat görevlisi, 2009 sonbaharına kadar inşaatın bir zenginleştirme tesisi olduğundan emin olmadıklarını söyledi.

Aynı dönemde İranlılar yabancı istihbarat örgütlerine nükleer tesislerini korumak için bir "pasif savunma stratejisi" izleyeceği yönünde açık kanıtlar sunuyordu. 24 Eylül 2007'de İran televizyonuna çıkan Pasif Savunma Örgütü başkanı Rıza Celali stratejilerinin "ülkenin önemli ve hassas tesislerini korumak ve kırılabilirliklerini en aza indirmek" olduğunu belirtti.

Celali, 24 Ağustos 2007'de Mehr haber ajansına verdiği demeçte de IAEA tarafından izlenen bir nükleer birimin de planın içinde olduğunu belirtti. NY Times'ın salı günü belirttiği gibi, İsfahan'daki uranyum dönüştürme tesisinin yakınlarında tünel inşaatları başladı.

Medya ısrarla İran'ın Kum'daki tesis hakkında IAEA'ya 21 Eylül'de yazılan bir mektupla bilgi verdiğini, bunun tek sebebinin de tesisin Batılı istihbaratçılarca keşfedilmesi olduğunu yazdı. Fakat aynı gün Obama yönetiminin yayımlanan soru-cevap metninde "Neden İranlılar bu tesisi bu zamanlamayla açmaya karar verdi?" soruna "Bilmiyoruz" cevabı veriliyordu.

Aslında İran'ın 21 Eylül'de IAEA'ya yazdığı ve bir özeti de 16 Kasım'daki IAEA raporunda yer alan mektup, ABD ve İsrail savaş planlarının kafasını karıştırmayı amaçlayan bir stratejinin parçası. Mektup, ikinci bir zenginleştirme tesisinin inşaatının "kendi bağımsızlığına dayanan ...hassas nükleer tesislerini pasif savunma mekanizmaları kullanarak koruma hakkına dayandığını" söylüyordu. Time dergisinden John Berry'nin 2 Ekim'deki haberinde belirttiği gibi, istihbarat analistleri mektubu izlenen bir düzine tünel yapısının dışında yapıların da bulunduğu şeklinde değerlendirildi.

Birkaç gün sonra İran cumhurbaşkanı Mahmud Ahmedinecad'a yakın olan gazete Kayhan, tesisle ilgili açıklamanın Batı tarafından yapılan saldırı planlarını püskürtmeye yardımcı olduğunu, çünkü "tesislerin çokluğunun etkin bir savunma sağladığını" yazdı.

Bu açıklama İran'ın başka nükleer tesisleri bulunduğu kuşku yaratarak ABD ve İsrail askeri planlarını karıştırmayı başardığı yönünde ipucu veriyor. NY Times'da yayınlanan makale de İran'ın stratejisinin ABD ve İsrail'de ülkenin nükleer programını yıkmamanın mümkün olup olmadığı konusunda kuşku yaratmakta başarılı olduğunu gösteriyor. Gazete tünel sistemini "Batı'nın askeri ve jeopolitik hesaplarını karıştıran" bir "gizlilik örtüsü" olarak niteledi. Bazı analistlerin İran'ın "pasif savunma stratejisi"nin Obama yönetiminin askeri olmayan bir çözümde ısrarında "önemli bir faktör" olduğunu belirttiğini de ekledi.

İran'ın stratejisinin İsrail'in hesapları üzerinde de etkisi olduğunu gösteren bir gelişme de 2002-2006 arasında İsrail Savunma Güçleri (IDF) istihbarat biriminin başında olan General Aharon Ze'evi Farkash'ın İsrail yanlısı Washington Yakın Doğu Politika Enstitüsü'nde geçen ekimde yapılan bir toplantıda ABD'nin İran'a hava saldırısı düzenlemesine destek vermesiydi.

Fakat Farkash Batının İran'ın bütün nükleer tesislerini bilemeyeceğini belirtti ve diğer açıklamalarında da İran'a bir İsrail saldırısına da karşı çıktı. ■

* Gareth Porter ABD ulusal güvenlik politikası üzerine uzmanlaşan araştırmacı bir tarihçi ve gazeteci.

OTHER LANGUAGES [Translations | Adaptations]

SWAHILI

Q&A: Kutoka Ajenda Rahisi ya Vita Hadi Mipango ya Amani

Mutsuko Murakami

TOKYO, Feb 9 (IPS) - Mutsuko Murakami anamhoji IKURO ANZAI, mkurugenzi wa heshima wa Makumbusho ya Kyoto kwa Ajili ya Amani Duniani.

Kati ya wastani wa makumbusho ya amani 170 ambayo yanapatikana duniani kote, theluthi yanapatikana nchini Japan.

Makumbusho ya Kyoto kwa Ajili ya Amani Duniani katika Chuo Kikuu cha Ritsumeikan, mjini Kyoto, yanavuta hisia za historia ya uvamizi wa nchi hiyo ikiwa ni pamoja na uzoefu wake wa wakati wa vita.

Anayeonekana kuwa nguvu kubwa nyuma ya Makumbusho ya Kyoto ni Dk Ikuro Anzai, ambaye pia ni mkurugenzi wake. Akiwa ni mhitimu wa udaktari, alikuwa mwalimu katika shule ya udaktari kabla ya kukaribishwa kufundisha masuala ya kimataifa katika Ritsumeikan mwaka 1986.

Dk Anzai tangu wakati huo amepata kutambuliwa na wanazuoni maarufu katika mafunzo ya amani na anatomika kama mkurugenzi wa heshima wa Taasisi ya Nanjing ya Utafiti wa Amani Kimataifa katika Chuo Kikuu cha Nanjing, China.

Mwaka 2008, Makumbusho hayo yalifanya Mkutano wa Kimataifa wa 6 kuhusu Makumbusho kwa Ajili ya Amani, ambao ulivuta zaidi ya washiriki 5,000 kutoka zaidi ya nchi 50. INMP inapanga kuwa na mkutano mwingine wa kimataifa mwaka 2010 huko Barcelona, ambao utafuatiwa na mwingine miaka miwili ijayo mjini The Hague.

Katika mahojiano na IPS, Profesa Anzai anajadili umuhimu wa makumbusho kwa ajili ya amani katika harakati za kutafuta amani duniani ikiwa ni pamoja na matarajio na changamoto zilizopo.

Q: Ni kwa nini Japan ina makumbusho mengi kwa ajili ya amani?

A: Kutokana na nchi yetu kujiingiza zaidi katika vita, iliacha makovu mengi, bila hata kutaja mambo ya kukumbuka kuweza kuoneshwa. Kabla ya vita na kwasehemu kutokana na watu wa (Japan) kuwa na uzoefu wa majanga ya mashambulizi ya nyuklia [akiwa na maana mabomu ya atomiki ya Hiroshima na Nagasaki], watu walijenga hamasa kubwa ya amani mioyoni mwao.

Mwaka 1978 Wajapan walikusanya saina milioni 30 kwa ajili ya Mkutano wa Kwanza wa Upokonyaji Silaha wa Baraza Kuu la Umoja Mataifa. Wamekuwa nguvu kuu wakitaka serikali za wilaya na miji kutokuruhusu nyuklia au kujenga makumbusho ya amani katika miji yao mikubwa kwa midogo. Hakika, mashirika ya kiraia nchini Japan yameonyesha uwezo wao wa kujenga amani.

Q: Unasema makumbusho ya amani yanaweza kufanya kazi kubwa zaidi ya kuweka kumbukumbu na kuonyesha ukweli wa kihistoria kuhusu vita na madhara yake na mateso kwa mwanadamu. Ni jukumu gani linatekelezwa na makumbusho ya amani katika jambo hili?

A: Kukuza "amani" na kuchangia kwa ufanisi zaidi katika kujenga amani duniani, makumbusho yanaweza kuandaa midahalo, kuonesha filamu, jitihada za utafiti, matembezi, mikutano ya amani na maonesho ya utalii, miongoni mwa mambo mengine. Tunaweza kujenga mtandao wa makumbusho hayo na kusaidiana kwa ajili ya lengo la pamoja pia. ➤➤➤

OTHER LANGUAGES [Translations | Adaptations]

Q: Ni sababu gani nyingine zilihamasisha makumbusho katika mwelekeo huu mpya?

A: Tumeona kukua kwa dhana ya amani tangu Dk. Johan Galtung – mwanazuoni wa Norway na mwanzilishi wa mafunzo ya amani – alipofasili miaka ya 1970. Amani siyo tu kukosekana kwa vita, anasema, lakini pia kila aina ya unyanyasaji, kunyimwa haki za binadamu, matumizi ya mazingira au kukiukwa kwa tamaduni. Tumehamisha msisitizo wetu katika makumbusho yetu kutoka ajenda rahisi ya kupinga vita na kuingia katika mafunzo mapana ya amani. Baadhi ya makumbusho ya amani pia yamerekebisha fasili hii mpya ya amani.

Q: Ni mambo gani yamefikiwa katika Mkutano wa Kimataifa wa Makumbusho kwa Ajili ya Amani wa Mwaka 2008? Hatua inayofuata ni ipi? A: Kwa kuongeza katika mafanikio ya mkutano wenyewe, ilipelekea sisi kujenga mfumo wa chombo chake cha maandalizi, INMP. Tumeifanya kuwa taasisi ya kisheria, imeunda katiba yake, imeteua viongozi wake, imejenga mfumo wake wa wanachama na kuanzisha ofisi ya kiutawala mjini The Hague. Profesa Peter van den Dungen wa mafunzo ya Amani katika Chuo Kikuu cha Bradford (nchini Uingereza) anakaimu nafasi ya mratibu wake mkuu. Mchakato huu wa kiutaasisishaji unatupatia mwanzo imara wa kuendelelea zaidi katika siku zijazo. Kupitia INMP, tunaweza kuimarisha umoja wetu, kupanua mafunzo yetu ya amani kwa kushirikiana (na taasisi zinazofanana na hizo) na kusaidia makumbusho mapya kuanzishwa. ■

TURKISH

Soru-cevap: Savaş Karşıtlığından Kapsamlı Barış Grişimlerine

Mutsuko Murakami'nin, Kyoto Dünya Barışı Müzesi onursal başkanı KURO ANZAI'yle röportajı

TOKYO, 1 Ocak (IPS) - Tüm dünyada bulunan yaklaşık 170 barış müzesinin üçte biri Japonya'da.

Kyoto'da bulunan Ritsumeikan Üniversitesi'ne bağlı Dünya Barışı Müzesi, Japonya'daki benzerleri arasında bir yükseköğretim kurumu içinde yer alan tek örnek. Müze ülkenin geçmişindeki saldırganlıklar kadar trajik savaş deneyimlerini de yansıtıyor. Japonya'nın eski başkentinde yer alan özel üniversite II. Dünya Savaşı sırasında ülkenin savaşçı politikalarının destekçisiydi.

1992'de barış çabalarının bir parçası olarak üniversitede bu müze açıldı ve şu ana kadar 900 binden fazla ziyaretçi kabul etti. Günümüzde de barış eğitimi kampanyaları ve hem yurt içinde hem de sınırın ötesinde yürüttüğü programlarla tanınıyor.

Müzenin ilk yöneticisi olan Dr. Ikuro Anzai bir doktor ve 1986'da üniversitede uluslar arası ilişkiler dersi vermeye davet edilmeden önce tıp fakültesinde ders veriyordu. O günden bu yana Dr. Anzai barış çalışmaları konusunda önemli bir isim haline geldi. Halen, Çin'deki Nanjing Üniversitesi'ne bağlı Uluslar arası Barış Enstitüsü'nde yönetici konumunda. Enstitü Çin'in eski başkentinde Aralık 1937'de Japonlar tarafından gerçekleştirilen kıyımla ilgili tarihi belgeleri derlemeye çalışıyor.

2008'de müze 50 ülkeden 5 bin katılımcıyı buluşturan 6. Uluslar arası Barış Müzeleri Konferansı'na ev sahipliği yaptı. İlki 1992'de düzenlenen konferans, Anzai'nin de yönetiminde olduğu müzeler arası bir ağın (Uluslar arası Barış Müzeleri Ağı-INMP) kurulmasını sağladı.

INMP gelecek toplantısını 2010'da Barselona'da yapmayı planlıyor. İki yıl sonra da Lahey'de toplanılacak. IPS'e verdiği röportajda Anzai barış müzelerinin uluslar arası alandaki barış çabaları açısından önemini tartışıyor. ➤➤➤

OTHER LANGUAGES [Translations | Adaptations]

IPS: Neden Japonya'da bu kadar çok barış müzesi var?

Ülkemizin savaş peşinde koşması sergilenecek anıtsal şeylerin yanı sıra çok fazla yaraya neden oldu. Savaş yüzünden ve kısmen de Japon halkının trajik nükleer saldırı deneyimleri nedeniyle [Hiroşima ve Nagazaki'ye yapılan atom bombası saldırılarını kastediyor] insanlarda barışı kovalamak için ciddi bir istek oluştu. 1978'de Japonlar Birleşmiş Milletler Genel Kurulunun silahsızlanma üzerine ilk özel oturumu için 30 milyon imza topladı. Halk yerel yönetimler üzerinde nükleerden arınmaları ve barış müzeleri kurmaları için baskı yaptı. Japonya'da sivil toplum barışı kurma yönünde güçlü bir kapasiteye sahip olduğunu gösterdi.

IPS: Siz barış müzelerinin savaşlarla ilgili tarihi gerçekleri derlemek ve insanların gördüğü zararı ve belgelemekten fazlasını yapabileceğini savunuyorsunuz. Bu açıdan müzelere ne rol düşüyor?

Barış okur-yazarlığını geliştirmek ve dünyada barışı kurma çabalarına daha verimli şekilde destek sunabilmek için müzeler sunumlar, film gösterimleri, araştırmalar, turlar, barış konferansları ve diğer etkinlikler düzenleyebilir. Ortak hedefe yürümek için bir işbirliği ağı kurabiliriz. Japonya'daki bazı müzeler şimdiden sergi malzemelerini paylaşıyor ve yeni programlar oluşturuyor. Diğer Asya müzelerinden küratörler ve yetkililer davet ederek fikir alışverişinde bulunduk. Birlikte, ziyaretçi bekleyeceğimiz sergilerden daha fazlasını yapabiliriz.

IPS: Müzeleri bu yöne iten diğer faktörler neler?

Dr. Johan Galtung 1970'de yeni bir tanımlamayla ortaya çıktığından bu yana barış kavramının evrildiğini gördük.

O, barışı sadece savaşın yokluğu olarak tanımlamanın ötesine geçerek her türlü şiddete, haklardan yoksun olmaya, doğanın katledilmesine ve kültürel şiddete de vurgu yapıyor. Biz de müzedeki vurgumuzu salt savaş karşıtlığından çıkararak kapsamlı bir barış çalışmasına yöneldik. Bazı diğer müzeler de bu yeni barış kavramını benimsedi.

IPS: 2008 ICMP konferansından ne çıktı? Yeni adımlar neler olacak?

Konferansın başarısına ek olarak, yönetim yapısı olan INMP için bir çerçeve oluşturuldu. Yasal statüye kavuşturuldu, bir anayasa hazırlandı, yetkililer atandı, üyelik sistemi kuruldu ve Lahey'de yönetim ofisi oluşturuldu.

Bradford Üniversitesi'nden Prof. Peter van den Dungen genel koordinatör olarak görev yapıyor. Bu kurumlaşma süreci bize ilerlemek için somut bir zemin sağladı. INMP üzerinden birliğimizi sağlamlaştırabilir, işbirliği içindeki barış çalışmalarımızı güçlendirebilir ve yeni müzelerin kurulmasına yardımcı olabiliriz.

IPS: Japon ordusunun 1937'de işlediği büyük adaletsizliği gözler önüne seren Nanjing Katliamı Müzesi'yle sıkı bağlar kurdunuz. Sizinki gibi girişimlerin Japonya ve Çin arasındaki uzlaşma çabalarına katkısı oldu mu?

Dünyada türünün en büyüğü olan Nanjing Müzesi katliam ve ızdırabı gösterse de aynı zamanda barış inşasını da içeriyor. Beni orada yönetici olarak atamaları önemli bir noktadır. Gerçek bir yüzleşme ve uzlaşma için çabalarımızı sürdüreceğiz. Bir gün Hiroşima Barış Müzesi'yle Nanjing arasında sergi değişimi yapacak noktaya geleceğimizi umuyorum.

IPS: Önünüzdeki sorunlar neler? Müzemizin yeni bir barış müzesi kompleksine evrilmesini görmek istiyorum. Bir barış için bilim ve teknoloji müzesi, ikincisi barış için uluslararası anlayış müzesi ve üçüncüsü de bir barış eğitimi için dijital kaynak müzesi kurulmasını öngörüyorum.

Uluslararası anlamda INMP'nin 2012 Lahey konferansına kadar gelişmesini bekliyorum. İnsanların sorumluluk üstlenmesinin önünü açacak bir buluşma olacak. ■



PICKUPS BY WEBSITES

Unified Approach Needed For Nuclear Disarmament

http://www.nuclearabolition.net/documents/COLUMN-unified_approach_needed_for_nuclear_disarmament.pdf

Link

<http://www.peoplesdecade.org/>

Iran Uses Fear of Covert Nuclear Sites to Deter Attack

<http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=49932>

Pick-ups

<http://original.antiwar.com/porter/2010/01/10/iran-uses-fear-to-deter-attack/>

<http://www.campaigniran.org/casmii/index.php?q=node/9199>

<http://www.twinside.org.sg/title2/resurgence/2010/233/world3.htm>

<http://www.globalissues.org/news/2010/01/10/4149>

<http://alethonews.wordpress.com/2010/01/11/iran-uses-fear-of-covert-nuclear-sites-to-deter-attack/>

<http://www.deepjournal.com/p/7/a/en/2502.html>

Links

<http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/node/49129>

<http://www.topix.com/ir/markazi/2010/01/politics-iran-uses-fear-of-covert-nuclear-sites-to-deter-attack>

<http://palestinianpundit.blogspot.com/2010/01/iran-uses-fear-of-covert-nuclear-sites.html>

<http://topics.npr.org/article/03k4gv3b6v2uk>

<http://www.iranamerica.com/forum/showthread.php?p=49650>

www.nuclearabolition.net

Q&A: From Simple Anti-War Agenda to Expansive Peace Initiatives

<http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=49873>

Pick-ups

<http://alternativestoempire.org/2009/12/11/politics-asia-inter-religious-forum-calls-for-nuclear-abolition/>

<http://www.ipseurope.org/news/news.php?key1=2009-12-08%2009:31:38&key2=1>

<http://news.indialocals.com/read/2009/12/08/ZJAwMTDIZQSVkMD5AQVkJZt=/politics-asia---inter-religious-forum-calls-for-nuclear-abolition->

<http://www.globalinfo.org/eng/newsweekly.asp?Dt=12/04/2009>

<http://www.globalissues.org/news/2010/01/01/4092>

Links

<http://www.zimbio.com/Peace+Studies>

<http://myacton8.com/wordpress/?cat=4>

<http://209.85.135.132/search?q=cache:n9w0ecMFsx4J:globalwireonline.org/2008/12/06/280/+%22Q%26A:+From+Simple+Anti-War+Agenda+to+Expansive+Peace+Initiatives%22&cd=12&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=de&client=firefox-a>

<http://globalwireonline.org/>



CIVIL SOCIETY'S PERSPECTIVE

Arms Control Experts Praise Nuclear Security Agenda Outlined in the President's State of the Union

January 28, 2010 | CONTACT: Katie Mounts, Director of External Relations

Washington, D.C. – Arms control experts at the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation praised the bipartisan nuclear security agenda reiterated by President Barack Obama in his State of the Union address.

“The President deserves praise for his continued efforts to lead a bipartisan nuclear security agenda that addresses the grave threat posed by nuclear weapons,” said Lt. Gen. Robert Gard, the Center’s chairman. “As the President said, he has embraced the vision of John F. Kennedy and Ronald Reagan through a strategy that reverses the spread of nuclear weapons and seeks a world without them.”

In his speech, the President identified key steps toward reducing the threat posed by nuclear weapons, including finalizing an agreement between the U.S. and Russia to verifiably reduce their nations’ nuclear weapons stockpiles, securing loose nuclear materials around the world in four years, holding a nuclear security summit with global leaders in Washington, D.C. in April, and dealing with the threats posed by North Korea and Iran.

Gard added, “Nearly every national security expert agrees that terrorist use of nuclear weapons against the United States is our gravest security threat. The best way to address the threat of nuclear terrorism is by securing vulnerable nuclear materials and verifiably reducing nuclear stockpiles, just as President Obama has pledged to do.”

“Today there is a growing bipartisan consensus that the current nuclear status quo is no longer tenable,” said the Center’s executive director John Isaacs. “21st century threats require 21st century solutions, and the President has already taken crucial first steps toward securing our nation from the threat of nuclear weapons.”

Indeed, just hours before giving the State of the Union, the President spoke with Russian President Dmitry Medvedev, and the leaders agreed that the negotiations to complete a successor to the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, which reduces the countries’ nuclear weapons stockpiles, are nearly complete.

“These first steps, including an expected finalized new weapons reduction treaty with Russia, are important and should be applauded,” Isaacs added, “but we still have a long way to go.”

The Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation is one of the nation’s oldest and largest organizations dedicated to reducing and eventually eliminating nuclear weapons. ■

CIVIL SOCIETY'S PERSPECTIVE

Obama at One Year: "A" for Transforming Nuclear Policy, Incomplete For Execution

January 19, 2010 | CONTACT: John Isaacs

Washington D.C. – The Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, one of the nation's major arms control organizations, gave President Barack Obama a grade of "A" for transforming United States nuclear weapons policy during his first year in office and an "Incomplete" for completing the new policy initiatives he has launched.

John Isaacs, the Center's executive director, praised the President for "elevating the attention of the world on the 23,000 nuclear weapons remaining across the globe and the danger that some of these weapons could fall into the hands of terrorists."

Isaacs added: "President Obama's forthrightness about the dangers of nuclear weapons and the need to take immediate action to avoid a nuclear holocaust constitute the most significant remarks by an American President on nuclear disarmament in the last half century."

On April 5, after less than three months in office, President Obama delivered one of the most significant speeches of the nuclear age. He stated:

"As the only nuclear power to have used a nuclear weapon, the United States has a moral responsibility to act. We cannot succeed in this endeavor alone, but we can lead it, we can start it . . . I state clearly and with conviction America's commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons."

On September 24, the President secured unanimous United Nations Security Council approval for the objective of a world free of nuclear weapons.

Lt. Gen. Robert Gard (U.S Army, ret.) the Center's chairman, emphasized that "while Obama's first year vision was vital, the ultimate judgment on Obama's performance will be based on how he begins to realize this vision over the coming months and years."

Gard pointed to the following key steps ahead:

- Completion and ratification of a new nuclear reductions treaty with Russia;
- Commencement of negotiations with Russia on the next nuclear reductions agreement, ideally down to a level of 1,000 nuclear weapons total for each side;
- Completion of a Nuclear Posture Review that revamps American nuclear policy;
- A new budget providing resources to begin securing all vulnerable nuclear material around the world within three or four years;
- A successful Global Nuclear Security Summit in April;
- A successful Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference in May;
- The launch of an aggressive campaign to win ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty;
- An international agreement to launch talks to end the production of fissile materials for military purposes;
- Successful negotiations with Iran and North Korea to terminate their nuclear weapons programs.

"This President deserves the Nobel Peace Prize for his vision and the initiatives he has launched, and we will work closely with him to realize that vision," concluded Gard. ■

CIVIL SOCIETY'S PERSPECTIVE

CND Protest to Call on Chilcot to Find Blair Guilty of Waging 'War of Aggression'

January 28, 2010

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament will ensure Tony Blair is reminded of the public anger at his decision to take the country to war on a lie as he enters the Iraq Inquiry tomorrow. Supporters of CND and the Stop the War Coalition will gather for a day-long series of events, including a 'naming of the dead' ceremony where relatives of those killed in the conflict will remember the deaths that Blair caused. The protest will be going ahead despite attempts by the Inquiry venue to prevent campaigners being seen by Blair'. See note 3 for details of the protest.

Kate Hudson, Chair of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, said "The more evidence we see, the clearer it becomes that Tony Blair took us to war on a lie. Evidence and legal justifications were cooked-up to validate his determination that Britain would stand firmly behind George Bush. So far Blair has rebutted all questioning by claiming he did "what he thought was right" but it is the responsibility of Sir John Chilcot and the Inquiry panel to ensure he cannot continue to cheat the British public of the answers they deserve.

"At its conclusion the Inquiry must not merely state facts but must also apportion blame. The legal justification for war without a UN resolution has never looked weaker. Truthful answers from Blair, admitting that he committed Britain to war regardless of the UN process, would make it clear that he was prepared to wage a war of aggression - one of the highest crimes under international law. The Inquiry must be prepared to find against him on the overwhelming evidence presented by officials intimately involved in the process. Tony Blair took the country into an illegal war and should be held to account for his criminal decision."

Commenting on the fact that despite the police stating they had no objections to a protest on the grassed area outside the Queen Elizabeth II Conference Centre, campaigners have been denied permission to gather there, Kate Hudson continued:

"It is disgraceful that the right to peaceful protest is being denied so blatantly. As the police say they have no security objections to our vigil being held outside the Inquiry, we can only assume that this is an attempt to protect Tony Blair from the overwhelming anti-war sentiment that exists in this country. It is only proper that he should see and hear those of us who have been proved right in our opposition to his war, particularly the many family members of those he sent to die. We have been told that the land outside the QEII centre is 'private land' yet this is a facility owned and operated by a publicly-owned government Executive Agency, under the authority of the Department of Communities and Local Government. This is clearly a political decision which we will not tolerate."

CND has long maintained that attacking Iraq without explicit UN-backing would be illegal and launched a court case against the government in 2002. CND's case was referred to in evidence to the Inquiry this Tuesday by Sir Michael Wood, formerly the chief legal adviser to the Foreign Office, with newly declassified documents underscoring how seriously the case's potential implications were taken. ■

CIVIL SOCIETY'S PERSPECTIVE

Nuclear Doomsday Clock Moves Away From Midnight - Scrapping Trident Will Push It Back Further

January 14, 2010

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament welcomed today's decision to move the hands on the nuclear 'doomsday clock' back from five to six minutes to midnight. The symbolic clock, charting the relative dangers of nuclear annihilation is controlled by the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists and has only been re-set 19 times since its inception in 1947.

Kate Hudson, Chair of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, said "This shift reflects the significant improvement since the end of the Bush era. Both Presidents Obama and Medvedev are committed to nuclear abolition and have put the issue firmly at the centre of the international political agenda. From the aggressive escalation of the Bush years we have seen a significant change in the US administration's approach to nuclear weapons. Now almost all states are pushing in a more sane direction.

"The progress towards major US/Russian reductions in warheads is creating an improved international climate ahead of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference in May – but now we need to translate aspirations into results. We need the Nuclear Weapons States to grasp this window of opportunity, commit to major reductions in warhead numbers and begin immediate negotiations on a Nuclear Weapons Convention. This would ban nukes in the way that chemical and biological weapons are successfully outlawed.

"As the third oldest nuclear state Britain can play a major role in taking us back from the nuclear brink. If the UK scraps Trident replacement, the hands on the Doomsday Clock will doubtless move back further. Britain needs to live up to its legal commitment to disarm, which it first made in signing the NPT over 41 years ago. Our government is still arguing that nuclear weapons are essential for our national security, but they actually make us less secure, encouraging other countries to come to the same view and develop their own nukes. Down that road lies unrestrained nuclear proliferation and increasingly inevitable nuclear war." ■



WHAT OTHERS SAY

Turning the Doomsday Clock

By Katie Mounts

Published in the Register Citizen on January 27, 2010.

Whether you are reading this article in Tampa or Tucson, Los Angeles or Long Island, one thing is for certain: It's six minutes to midnight.

While this may not be the normal mode of timekeeping for your dinner plans, it's true for the "Doomsday Clock," which figuratively marks the time remaining until the end of the world, due to a nuclear holocaust or an overheated planet. Drawing particular attention to progress made on nuclear weapons issues, a group of prominent scientists—including 19 Nobel laureates—decided on January 14 to move the clock's minute-hand farther from midnight, from 11:55 p.m. to 11:54 p.m.

#What seems like a fleeting amount of time when discussing daily routines is actually quite a significant move for the clock. Created in 1947, its hands have been moved just 19 times in 62 years.

So why the recent move?

In turning back the clock, the scientists recognized the significant progress made in the past year toward reducing the dangers posed by nuclear weapons.

This progress reflects renewed leadership on the part of the United States in raising awareness about nuclear dangers, and fostering the international dialogue and cooperation needed to combat the nuclear threat.

Specifically, this progress includes improved international commitment to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the cornerstone of international efforts to stem the spread of nuclear weapons; discussions with Iran to rein in its nuclear program; the announcement of an international conference of world leaders in Washington, DC in April to discuss nuclear terrorism prevention strategies; growing support for the passage of a treaty to ban nuclear testing; and negotiations between the U.S. and Russia to reduce their still-enormous nuclear weapons stockpiles.

This final step—negotiations to cut Russian and American arsenals—will be critical to advancing the nuclear security agenda.

The United States and Russia are negotiating a new treaty to succeed the landmark 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (known as START), which expired on December 5. START signaled the end of the Cold War by reducing the numbers of nuclear weapons the United States and Russia possessed, and providing for important monitoring and verification stipulations to ensure that each side complied with the treaty.

After beginning negotiations in April of last year, President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev have made tremendous strides towards completing an agreement. Once the treaty is signed, the Senate will need to approve it. Unlike most votes, however, treaty approval requires 67 "yea" votes.

A nuclear reductions treaty would greatly enhance American security. Though the Cold War ended two decades ago, the United States and Russia still possess 95 percent of the 23,000 nuclear weapons remaining in the world. Today, more nuclear weapons mean more opportunities for theft by terrorists or accidents by the hands of those controlling the stockpiles. The same weapons that provided a sense of security during the Cold War are today our gravest security threat. >>>



WHAT OTHERS SAY

The good news is that there's strong bipartisan support for further nuclear weapons reductions. Leading Republicans, such as Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, Senator John McCain (R-AZ), Senator Richard Lugar (R-IN), and former Secretaries of State Henry Kissinger and George Shultz, support a verifiable new nuclear reductions treaty.

Despite gains made in the past year, though, almost all the hard work of reducing nuclear dangers has yet to begin. The Iranian and North Korean nuclear programs, the vulnerability of dangerous nuclear materials to theft by terrorists, and the continued risks of an accidental or unauthorized nuclear exchange between existing nuclear nations are stark reminders that the world stands on the edge of a proliferation tipping point. Twenty-first century threats require innovative and global solutions. Reducing the numbers of nuclear weapons in the world and preventing their further spread will require concerted effort by many nations and sustained leadership from the United States.

Finalizing a treaty to succeed START is an important first step, but it is just that—a first step. 11:54 p.m. is still too late if the world ends at midnight. ■

Imagine Haiti with Radiation Sickness and Burns: Why We Must Disarm

By Linda Gunter, AlterNet
Posted on January 27, 2010

If you want to know what the aftermath of a nuclear attack might look like, go to Haiti today. Then picture those same hundreds of thousands -- and possibly several million -- of already suffering people also enduring radiation sickness and severe burns. 'No thanks', I hear you say, 'it's bad enough already'.

Quite right. It is. Which is why the prospect of nuclear war is always bracketed with the words "unimaginable horror;" except of course it is not "unimaginable" since the United States already inflicted such a nightmare on the people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The seismic shock that hit Haiti was so great that, according to Roger Musson of the British Geological Survey, the energy released was equivalent to a half-megaton nuclear bomb -- or about 38 Hiroshima bombs.

Unfortunately, the prospect of an accidental or even deliberate nuclear attack is well within the scope not only of our imagination but of reality. And, like Haiti, the target country could be one -- or even two -- of the poorest in the world, densely populated and impoverished and equally ill-equipped to cope with such an abrupt tragedy. That is because a nuclear conflagration today is more likely between India and Pakistan -- already at daily unofficial war and armed to the teeth with nuclear weapons -- than between Russia and the United States which are back at the negotiating table.

How likely is it? Not quite as likely as it used to be, according to the board of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, who on January 14 turned back their famous Doomsday Clock by one minute, from five minutes to midnight to six. They wrote: "For the first time since atomic bombs were dropped in 1945, leaders of nuclear weapons states are cooperating to vastly reduce their arsenals and secure all nuclear bomb-making material."

➤➤➤



WHAT OTHERS SAY

Nor has the danger of nuclear weapons coming into the possession of terrorists been mitigated by the "elephant in the room" that the arms control community rarely acknowledges and refuses to touch: the spread of nuclear power technology. Permitted under the flawed Article IV of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, countries that agree never to develop nuclear weapons are awarded "the inalienable right" to develop nuclear energy programs instead. This, not surprisingly, provides the materials, personnel, technology and know-how to develop nuclear weapons anyway, even clandestinely, which is exactly how India and Pakistan got theirs in the first place. Today, at least 40 countries possess enough materials from their civilian programs to transition to nuclear weapons. Much of the Middle East is attempting to add itself to that list.

If India and Pakistan were to use their nuclear arsenals against each other, the disaster that is Haiti today would be greatly magnified and the repercussions would be felt far across the planet. According to a group of scientists -- some of whom worked with Dr. Carl Sagan on the original nuclear winter findings and who researched such a scenario in two 2007 studies -- the smoke plume pathways from the resulting fires would result in a nuclear winter-like effect, destroying agriculture and altering the climate far from the point of conflict. Global agriculture would thus be decimated causing widespread and catastrophic famine.

Agricultural collapse is an often cited consequence of climate change as well. Indeed, the twin catastrophes of the climate crisis and of nuclear war share some similar outcomes. However, nuclear weapons have the capacity to bring on global tragedy far faster than climate change, while allowing little or no time for adaptive or even preventive measures to be taken.

Opportunities to disarm in 2010 abound. The U.S. is expected to finally ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, as pledged by President Barack Obama. He and Russian president, Dimitry Medvedev, are due to finalize a new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty. The nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty review conference will take place at the United Nations in New York in May, preceded by a Global Nuclear Security Conference in Washington, DC in April.

The presence, proliferation and potential use of nuclear weapons remain, arguably, the number one threat to our planetary survival. Our leaders have the opportunity to act. Nuclear abolition -- if we wish never to see a "nuclear Haiti" -- must happen and it is up to all of us to maintain the pressure on our leadership until it does.

Linda Gunter is co-founder of Beyond Nuclear.

© 2010 Independent Media Institute.

This article is being reproduced only for personal information of the recipients and readers of this newsletter. ■

WHAT OTHERS SAY

Conference Urges Canada to Press Policies against Nuclear Weapons

(CP) – Jan 27, 2010

OTTAWA — Activists are urging the Canadian government to play a bigger role in the effort to eliminate nuclear weapons.

Anti-nuclear groups including Project Ploughshares and the Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons want Prime Minister Stephen Harper to speak out on disarmament.

They say Canada should press NATO to review its nuclear strategies and urge the removal of tactical nuclear weapons from Europe.

They also say the government should encourage the involvement of civil society in the nuclear debate by sending NGO delegates to a conference later this year which will review the non-proliferation treaty.

The activists held a two-day conference in Ottawa this week to set out a Canadian agenda on disarmament.

Doug Roche, former MP, senator and one-time Canadian ambassador for disarmament, says the world has a clear opportunity for progress since President Barack Obama has committed himself to disarmament.

In Prague last year, Obama said nuclear disarmament can be achieved, although it will take years and may not arrive in his lifetime.

Roche said Wednesday the conference recommendations recognize the importance of the president's move. "Those recommendations centre on the need for Prime Minister Harper to find early opportunities to speak out on behalf of the support that President Obama needs and also to give support to those calls that are now being made for a new global treaty to ban nuclear weapons," Roche said.

He said there are 23,000 nuclear weapons around the world, with the power of 150,000 Hiroshima bombs.

To use them, he said, would be immoral and illegal, so why not get rid of them?

Copyright © 2010 The Canadian Press.

This article is being reproduced only for personal information of the recipients and readers of this newsletter. ■