



What's new in nukes

An occasional NoNukes campaign update

THIS ISSUE

- [DDPR: Or why NATO is unlikely to get rid of obsolete TNW](#)
- [New bombs?](#)
- ["Jesus loves nukes"?](#)
- [International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons- Update](#)
- [NukeM](#)
- [IKV Pax Christi Expert Group Meeting](#)
- [PeaceBoat in Amsterdam](#)
- [Recommended Reading & Resources](#)
- [Calendar of upcoming events](#)

About No Nukes

The No Nukes campaign is IKV Pax Christi's program for nuclear disarmament.

IKV Pax Christi is a cooperation between the Dutch Interchurch Peace Council (IKV) and Pax Christi Netherlands.

We strive for a world free of nuclear weapons by informing, writing, lobbying and campaigning, both in the Netherlands and abroad.

If you want to know more about the No Nukes campaign, go to nonukes.nl

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2011

Dear friends and colleagues,

In this edition of *What's new in nukes?* we have a selection of articles that look back at what the No Nukes team has done the last few months and look ahead to upcoming events and processes- especially around NATO. We also include some interesting reading recommendations about Iran, and current policies of engagement around its nuclear programmes.

While the U.S. just dismantled one of its biggest ever nuclear bombs (the B53- see [here](#) for more information), questions about the remaining U.S. gravity bombs in Europe remain. The article "What about the DDPR" examines the current discussions going on within NATO about these weapons, while the article "New Bombs?" probes deeper behind the driving forces, and financial implications, of keeping these weapons. As many around the world are currently [occupying their own Wall Streets](#), the role of weapons manufacturers in lobbying to retain obsolete weapons must be critically examined and challenged.

In the recommended reading section, we highlight the website www.aLittleMoreAction.org as a way that you can help speed the pace of nuclear disarmament and encourage your foreign ministry to correct the failure of the international community to negotiate multilateral nuclear disarmament.

We hope you find this newsletter helpful, and as always, welcome your feedback.

*With best wishes,
Susi Snyder*

[back to top](#)

DDPR: Or why NATO is unlikely to get rid of obsolete TNW



The allies in 2010 failed to come to a decision on the future of the American tactical nuclear weapons now deployed in the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, Italy and Turkey. Countries like Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium argued that the TNW are obsolete, that conventional weapons and American long range nuclear weapons provide enough extended deterrence and therefore TNW can be safely removed. A handful of countries, France being the most vocal, argued against removal.

To be able to conclude the discussions on the NATO Strategic Concept, in November 2010, the allies decided to push the discussion on TNW ahead and to make it part of a comprehensive review of all NATO's defence and deterrence capabilities and policies. This Defence and Deterrence Posture Review (DDPR) is now in progress and will be concluded on 20 and 21 May 2012, when NATO heads of state meet in Chicago.

A lot is unclear about the DDPR, but what we do know is that over the summer, the allies decided on the 'terms of reference' which include a planning of the drafting process and delegates parts of the drafting to specific NATO bodies. The drafting of paragraphs on the TNW is in the hands of the High Level Group –an advisory group for the Nuclear Planning Group in which all NATO countries are represented except France.

Delegating the drafting to the HLG is a choice against transparent decision making. The HLG is a text book case of an Old Men's Club lacking any democratic backing. The whole outfit is so shady that it's even hard to find out who's part of it. HLG documents are habitually classified, without clear reasons why. To make matters worse, the HLG's only *raison d'être* is exactly that NATO has nuclear weapons, which makes it unlikely that the Old Men will advise an end of TNW deployment in Europe. It's like asking the baker how much bread you should eat. A responsible baker may tell you to eat more brown bread, with pips, but you can't expect him to give neutral advice about whether you need bread at all. People who serve in the HLG do so because they believe NATO needs nuclear weapons and they will advise accordingly. Several diplomats of national delegations at NATO have told us in the past months that they have been objecting to involving the HLG for precisely these reasons. They too anticipate that the HLG is too biased to be able to properly reflect the wishes and needs of a majority of member states.

By allowing the HLG to coordinate the drafting process, NATO frames the debate in a way that is lacking transparency, or any form of democratic check. This should have been unacceptable for countries like Germany, The Netherlands, Norway, Iceland, Slovenia, Belgium, Luxemburg and Greece. But apparently it wasn't.

The timing of the process is that the HLG will, between now and February, consult member states and 'other stakeholders' and then present its recommendations. It is entirely unclear who the HLG will consult. Only representatives of ministries of Defence, or Foreign Affairs, or both? Will they consider the plethora of parliamentary resolutions calling for early withdrawal of these weapons from Europe? Will they hear the opinion of the majority of experts and NGO's calling for withdrawal of the TNW, or will they listen to representatives of industries that are currently involved in the lucrative modernization and refurbishment programs? And who will assess whether the HLG has done its job properly? From February onward, the North Atlantic Council (NAC) will coordinate the process of writing a final text that is acceptable to all members. Although formally the decision making will happen only in April and May of 2012, it is to be expected that much of the wheeling and dealing will happen during or around the February and March 2012 NATO ministerial.

In the end, it is up to all the states individually to decide how much political capital they are willing to invest in trying to achieve any given aim. For governments of countries like the Netherlands and Germany, who have promised their parliaments and public a transparent debate and who aim to end the deployment of TNW, the question is how far they are willing to go to get what they want. Will they be willing to fight the biased advice of the HLG? Are they willing to confront France? For any minister, the eventual outcome will have to be the result of a process of give and take. The question is therefore not if TNW can be removed – they can be. The question is if our

governments are willing to go the extra mile – willing if necessary to pay a price for getting rid of nonsensical nukes.

IKV Pax Christi believes that the governments of Germany, Belgium and the Netherlands need to step up their efforts to get rid of the obsolete TNW. To get what they want, we advise them to give France and the other outliers an ultimatum: This is the last opportunity to come to a conclusion on TNW in consensus – a most preferable outcome. If NATO once again fails to do away with these dinosaur nuclear weapons, the three will negotiate together with the U.S. a time table for withdrawal. Letting them stay in Europe is simply no longer an option.

- *Wilbert van der Zeijden*

New bombs?



In the article above they were mentioned already: Companies involved in lucrative modernisation and refurbishment deals. What's that all about?

If NATO again fails to end the deployment of the old B61 bombs it has a couple of financially and politically interesting consequences. The current B61 bombs are near the end of their life cycle and need to be replaced with new ones. The nuclear core remains the same, but almost every other component needs to be replaced, currently plans are also to redesign them. The current 'analogue' bombs that drop to the ground dangling from the end of a parachute will be replaced by digitally guided bombs that hurtle towards their targets with more precision. The changes are so fundamental that the American nuclear laboratories themselves now warn that the new designs are getting too far away from the originally tested designs to be able to guarantee their functionality and safety.

The costs for this refurbishment and life extension are picked up by the U.S. But the host states in Europe can expect additional costs too. For new procedures training of course, but also because the new bombs demand new modifications of the aircraft flying them. For the Netherlands for example, it means that a decision is needed by around 2018 on modifying the F-16 now designated to fly B61 missions. Perhaps the Dutch can delay the refurbishment a couple years until they have new aircraft, but in any case, this new aircraft will need expensive modifications to be able to fly nuclear missions. The exact costs are unknown, or at least not made public, but what we do know is that the modifications for carrying B61s on a Joint Strike Fighter – the aircraft the Netherlands are likely to buy – will come to at least 340 million U.S. dollars. \$340 million, or 244 million Euro, in addition to the cost of the JSF itself.

For Germany, continued deployment of TNW in Buechel would have even more ridiculous consequences. The Germans have basically already chosen a new aircraft that will not be able to carry B61 bombs. To be able to maintain the ability to fly nuclear missions, Germany will have to keep the current ageing Tornado aircraft in the air much longer than anticipated. In addition, it seems that the upgraded B61 bombs will simply not fit under the wing of the Tornado because the new tail-wing of the bomb is too big. The 'solution' would be that the bombs assigned to Tornado's maintain the old tail-kit, but without the original parachute. This would –ironically enough - make them less reliable, and significantly reduce their credibility as a 'deterrent'. But what does that matter if no one is seriously considering using them anyway....

Finally, there's the problem that continued deployment of nukes in Europe prevents the host countries and the U.S. from making the best decisions on cuts in military spending. The financial, bank, housing, credit and Euro crisis have led all involved countries to cut back on defence budgets considerably. The prolonged deployment of the B61 to six bases in Europe means the participating countries need to continue spending on training of pilots, security personnel, and maintenance among other things. Only this week, a U.S. company called Atlantic CommTech Corp was awarded a 12 million U.S. dollar (8.62 million Euro) contract to improve security of the 6 nuclear bases in Europe, that's 2 million USD or 1.44 million Euro per base just for 'redundant cable' and new 'intrusion detection systems' around the nuclear vaults. Probably to keep out Belgian 'Bomb Spotting'-activists.

- *Wilbert van der Zeijden*

“Jesus loves nukes”?



In early August 2011, the headline ‘Jesus loves nukes’ appeared in some media outlets referring to the U.S. Air Force suspension of a military ethics course. This course had referred to bible texts and Christian ethics to justify the use of nuclear weapons. The course was suspended, but for the wrong reason. Instead of suspending the course because it misrepresented the Christian tradition of moral abhorrence of nuclear weapons, it was suspended because it might violate the separation between church and state. It is the virtually unanimous moral judgment of the Christian churches that nuclear war can never be justified. This unites the pacifist churches and those who do not exclude military violence as a last resort within the limitations of the ‘Just War’ criteria.

The moral debate about nuclear weapons was quite alive during the Cold War. It is gaining attention again. Media are reporting what the Holy See and especially U.S. church leaders say. Just as with the abolition of slavery, moral delegitimation precedes legal measures. The Roman Catholic church is moving into the direction of declaring both the use and threat of nuclear weapons illegal. See the current debate [here](#) , and recent church statements [here](#).

CCADD

The morality of war was quite prominent during this year’s Conference on Christian Approaches to Defence and Disarmament (CCADD), which took place in early September in Birmingham (U.K.). CCADD is an annual event that is attended by about 40 experts from different disciplines: diplomats, military, academics, church officials, and people from peace movements. Last year’s conference, hosted by the Netherlands and organized by IKV Pax Christi, focused on nuclear weapons. This year the theme was ‘Ten Years After 9/11’. Keynote speakers were Sir Michael Howard (British military historian) and Lord Des Browne (former Secretary of Defence and prominent in the ‘European Leadership Network for Multilateral Nuclear Disarmament and Non-proliferation’).

Almost every session at the CCADD discussed moral dilemmas. In today’s conflicts, the distinctions between ‘war’ and other forms of military violence become blurred. What does this mean for ethics and law? A participant from the intelligence community, referring to his dilemmas after 9/11 as to interrogation and information collecting, called for the development of ‘just intelligence’ criteria, parallel to the ‘Just War’ tradition. The threat of nuclear terrorism was not a separate theme, but it loomed over the conference. The key theme emerging for those working on nuclear disarmament from the CCADD was the need to better integrate our zero nuclear weapons goal into the broader security debate.

Other Ecumenical work

On 29 August, a small ecumenical delegation including IKV Pax Christi visited Brussels to discuss nuclear policy with two senior NATO officials. This was the result of the [letter](#) sent in March 2011 by the World Council of Churches, the Conference of European Churches, and the national councils of churches in the U.S. and Canada. In his reply, NATO Secretary General Rasmussen had encouraged further contributions.

The discussion focused on the remaining U.S. tactical nuclear weapons in Europe and the prospects of NATO’s Defence and Deterrence Posture Review (DDPR). While the main message was ‘Don’t be too optimistic’, we were also encouraged to continue the discussion, which we fully intend to do.

- Laurens Hogebrink

International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons- Update



More than a hundred campaigners from around the world came together in Geneva in September at the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons conference. The conference focused on ways to stimulate action towards a nuclear weapons free world. Lessons from the International Campaign to Abolish Landmines, the drive for a treaty banning cluster munitions, as well as ways to reframe the nuclear weapons debate in light of the current global security situation were just some of the presentations. The workshops brought together participants in hands on discussions about how to implement divestment campaigns, engage with Parliamentarians and expand campaign efforts to new constituencies.

A series of podcasts and videos were produced from the conference - available here: <http://www.icanw.org/conference2011>.

A lot of great campaign tools are available on the International ICAN website: www.icanw.org.

For more information on getting involved in the Dutch ICAN efforts, contact [Peter Paul Ekker](#).

-Susi Snyder

NukeM



On the international day against nuclear tests, IKV Pax Christi's No Nukes team launched an educational facebook application- NukeM. NukeM is designed to inform facebook users about the deadly impact of the use of nuclear weapons.

The application uses extremely conservative figures, yet still reflects the deadly reality of the possible use of nuclear weapons. To date, more than 10,000 facebook users have been virtually killed by this application, redirecting them to learn more about nuclear weapons and how they are used - as a political weapon - every day.

You too can bomb your friends into greater awareness, and nuke them into action. It's simple, while you're logged into facebook open another browser window and load up www.NukeM.info

Spread the word to halt the spread of nuclear weapons.

- Susi Snyder

IKV Pax Christi Expert Group Meeting



On 30 and 31 August, IKV Pax Christi organized a two day meeting on the future of TNW. The meeting brought together a dozen of the leading global experts and institutes that work on NATO nuclear weapons. Participating experts from the British American Security Information Centre (BASIC), the Federation of American Scientists (FAS), the Arms Control Association (ACA), Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg (IFSH), the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) and NATO Watch joined us to talk about the state of the debate in NATO on TNW, and to look ahead and discuss opportunities to intervene successfully in the NATO debate.

On the first day, we were joined by three key NATO insiders who openly shared their knowledge and vision. To allow for such openness, the meeting was deliberately off the record, and we decided to make no report.

Nevertheless, it is fair to conclude that the participants shared a sense of frustration about the lack

of transparency from NATO's side and a sense of urgency: Listening to the insiders, it seems likely that NATO again will fail to use the opportunity of the Defence and Deterrence Posture Review to rid itself of the irrelevant TNW.

The outcomes of the meeting will shape the work of the No Nukes team in the coming months as we continue to try and influence the decision making processes within NATO in favour of withdrawal of American nuclear weapons from Europe.

-Wilbert van der Zeijden

PeaceBoat in Amsterdam



On Sunday 4 September the Peace Boat docked at the Passenger Terminal Amsterdam. Together with GPPAC and Peace Boat the No Nukes team organised a roundtable session on safety and security in the nuclear age.

A Hibakusha, a survivor of the nuclear bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Ike Teuling (Greenpeace the Netherlands), Tamira Combrink (City Council Member in Amsterdam, GroenLinks), Takemura Shinichi (member of the Japanese Government appointed Reconstruction Design Council, which overlooks the post-Fukushima recovery), Susi Snyder (programme leader Nuclear Disarmament Programme, IKV Pax Christi), Duco Hellema (Professor of the History of International Relations, Utrecht University) and Yoshioka Tatsuya (founder and director of Peace Boat) reflected on safety and security concerns of nuclear energy and nuclear weapons. After the interesting round table session all visitors could wave and say goodbye to the Peace Boat, which was on its way to a new destination: Copenhagen.

-Peter Paul Ekker

Recommended Reading & Resources



There are a number of newly available social media tools to spur action for a nuclear weapons free world.

The Australian Red Cross society has launched a website www.targetnuclearweapons.org.au, where they are collecting signatures to take to the international gathering of Red Cross/Crescent societies in Geneva mid-November. They are hoping to adopt a Movement-wide policy on nuclear weapons. You are encouraged to visit the site and cast your vote!

Recognising the 15 year disarmament deadlock in the Conference on Disarmament, a few campaigners put together this website and video to encourage people to use twitter to press their Foreign Ministers to act in support of nuclear abolition negotiations now.

www.alittlemoreaction.org

Tactical nuclear weapons: The British American Security Information Council (BASIC) and the Arms Control Association (ACA) published a report called "[Reducing the role of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe](#)." It analyses why the TNW can go, but also offers practical proposals for NATO countries to consider. BASIC in addition published a report [specifically on Italy](#) and its involvement in deploying TNW in Europe. Oliver Meier of the ACA wrote a [policy paper](#) and several very [useful articles](#) on the DDR process.

The Cicero Foundation – according to its website an “independent pro-EU and pro-Atlantic think tank” published an interesting if wildly anti-Russian report called "[Russia's embrace of tactical nuclear weapons](#)." Let's hope someone writes a more balanced report to match in the coming weeks.

Missile defence: Following the triumphant news reports in mainstream media about the successful introduction of a rudimentary form of missile defence in Europe, it is worthwhile to read this New York Times article by Yousaf Butt called "[The Delusion of Missile Defence](#)". Butt is scientific consultant of the Federation of American Scientists (FAS).

Iran and a Middle East Zone Free of Weapons of Mass Destruction: The Washington Quarterly published an article called "[Doubling Down on Iran](#)" by Obama advisors Pollock and Takeyh who explain how 'the West' should block Iran from building a bomb in great detail. The "carrot and stick" approach has failed they argue, and a new approach is needed in which any means are justified except – for now – an invasion. Sanctions, special forces, targeted killings, divestment, scare tactics, it's all in there. The article triggered a [fierce response](#) by international relations expert and self-proclaimed "realist in ideological times" Stephen Walt who argues that the kind of measures that Pollock and Takeyh propose will surely make Iran realise that the only thing that can save them now from Western aggression is... a bomb.

Calendar of upcoming events



Tuesday 8 November - Pax-It café

On the 8th of November the No Nukes team will participate in a Pax-It café discussion 'Who fears Iran?'. The Pax-It café will take place at 19.00h in [Louis Hartlooper Complex](#) in Utrecht. Speakers: Sico van der Meer (researcher at Clingendael), Yalda Walinezhad (Iranian student), Paul Aarts (lecturer in International Relations at the Department of Political Science (University of Amsterdam) and Wilbert van der Zeijden (researcher Nuclear Disarmament IKV Pax Christi). This is a free event and open to all. Spoken language: Dutch.

Wednesday 9 November - Event at de Balie

The next day IKV Pax Christi and De Balie have organized a discussion '*Charlie, Bravo Navo!*', an evening discussion on the role of NATO and the Netherlands and its army within NATO. Speakers: Rem Korteweg (strategic analyst at the Hague Centre for Strategic Studies) and Leon Wecke (researcher at the Centre for International Conflict - Analysis & Management). The discussion will take place at [De Balie](#) in Amsterdam at 21.00h. Spoken language: Dutch. Entrance: students €6,00, normal €8,00. [TICKETS](#)

[back to top](#)