

Draft of new page

# *Arsenals & Treaties*

[Graphic, such as a large nuclear missile being launched. Could be clip art. But see references in e-mail.]

[Graphic: such as a treaty depicted as two printed pages, like an open book. Could be clip art.]

*This web page provides factual information about the global nuclear arsenal. This tell us how many and what kinds of weapons must be eliminated as we seek to get to zero.*

*This web page also provides information on nuclear arms control and disarmament treaties. This is the heritage to build upon in future nuclear disarmament efforts. We also present proposals for new agreements designed to achieve nuclear disarmament.*

[The following should be set up like the beginning of other pages -- Religious Statements, Military Leaders Speak Out -- with same type face, use of bullets, spacing, background boxes, etc. The main headings and each bullet item should be linked to items below.]

## **GLOBAL NUCLEAR ARSENAL**

- \* **Facts on Current Arsenal**
- \* **Projections for Future**

## **NUCLEAR ARMS TREATIES**

- \* **Directory of Treaties**
- \* **Moscow Treaty of 2002**
- \* **Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty**
- \* **World Court Ruling**
- \* **Model Nuclear Weapons Convention**
- \* **Other Treaty Proposals**

***Global Nuclear Arsenal*** [set heading in colored box like in Religious Statements]

- \* **Facts on Current Arsenal** [link to below]
- \* **Projections for Future** [link to below]

[in box]

### **World's Current Nuclear Arsenal**

[Graphic showing three types of nuclear weapons: land-based intercontinental missile, submarine shooting a missile, bomber.]

*Governments possessing nuclear weapons do not publish detailed information about their inventory. However, by drawing on various sources outside organizations are able to provide informed estimates. In doing so, they make a distinction between "strategic nuclear weapons" that are capable of striking an adversary's homeland from a long distance and "tactical, or non-strategic, nuclear weapons" intended for battlefield use.*

## **Inventory**

*The **Center for Defense Information** [[www.cdi.org](http://www.cdi.org)], an independent military research organization based in Washington, D.C., provides the following estimates of nuclear warheads possessed by eight nations, as of February 2002.*

[Import table including flags that matches the following from  
<http://www.cdi.org/issues/nukef&f/database/nukearsenals.cfm>]

<b>Country</b>	<b>Suspected Strategic Nuclear Warheads</b>	<b>Suspected Non-Strategic Warheads</b>	<b>Suspected Total Nuclear Warheads</b>
China	250	120	400
France	350	0	350
India	60	?	60+?
Israel	100-200	?	200+
Pakistan	24-48	?	24-48
Russia	~6,000	~4,000	~10,000
United Kingdom	180	5	185
United States	8,646	2,010	10,656

[At bottom table put source in smaller type:]

Source: Center for Defense Information, used with permission.

*Detailed description of the nuclear weapons systems of each nation is available from CDI's Nuclear Weapons Database [<http://www.cdi.org/issues/nukef&f/database/index.cfm>].*

*Also, each issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists contains a Nuclear Notebook [<http://www.thebulletin.org/issues/nukenotes/nukenote.html>] containing up-to-date facts and figures on the world's nuclear weapons and weapons facilities. This information is provided by Robert S. Norris of the Natural Resources Defense Council and William Arkin.*

## **Targeting**

[graphic of nuclear explosion with mushroom cloud; a source is

<http://www.geocities.com/area51/vault/5862/nukepics.html>]

*The United States has a Single Integrated Operational Plan (SIOP) that determines how its nuclear weapons will be targeted. Although targeting is secret, the Natural Resources Defense Council conducted a computer simulation, based upon known nuclear doctrine, to gauge how nuclear weapons might be used according to the secret U.S. Nuclear War Plan.*

*[<http://www.nrdc.org/nuclear/nwarplan.asp>]. Although this study pre-dates the Bush Administration's Nuclear Posture Review, the NRDC shows a targeting pattern with about the same level of strategic nuclear warheads as contemplated under the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty of 2002.*

*Information on the targeting of Russian nuclear weapons is not available. However, those who understand Russian nuclear strategy believe that U.S. military bases, command and control centers (such as the Pentagon), and major U.S. cities are targeted by the Russian war plan.*

[end box]

[begin new box]

## **Projections for the Future**

*The Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty, [<http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/sort/index.html>] signed by U.S. President Bush and Russian President Putin in May 2002 requires that the two sides reduce their nuclear arsenals to between 1,700 and 2,200 warheads by the end of 2012. The treaty itself doesn't specify the composition of these arsenals. However, the Center for Defense information has developed an estimate of Likely Nuclear Arsenals under the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (Moscow Treaty). [<http://www.cdi.org/issues/nukef&f/database/startab.html>] This includes estimates for both the United States and Russia.*

[end box]

## ***Nuclear Arms Treaties*** [set heading in colored box like in Religious Statements]]

- \* **Directory of Treaties** [link to below]
- \* **Moscow Treaty of 2002** [link to below]
- \* **Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty** [link to below]
- \* **Ruling of International Court of Justice** [link to below]
- \* **Model Nuclear Weapons Convention** [link to below]
- \* **Other Treaty Proposals** [link to below]

*Shortly after nuclear bombs were dropped on Japan in 1945, discussion began about the need for international agreements to control this new form of warfare. In 1946 the first session of the newly formed United Nations General Assembly took up this subject but was unable to achieve an agreement. Since then numerous treaties have been proposed, negotiated, and entered into. Treaties continued to be proposed as a means of achieving the global elimination of nuclear weapons.*

[begin box]

## **Directory of Treaties**

*[possibly repeat the graphic on treaties from top of page]  
In the United States the official source for treaties and agreements is the U.S. Department of State [<http://www.state.gov/t/ac/trty/>]. This source provides historic background information as well as the text of the treaty.*

*The **Federation of American Scientists** [[www.fas.org](http://www.fas.org)] has compiled a listing of arms control agreements [<http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/index.html>]. This includes treaty text, summary of provisions, and current status.*

*The **Nuclear Age Peace Foundation** [[www.wagingpeace.org](http://www.wagingpeace.org)] in Santa Barbara, California maintains a web site on nuclear files containing information on nuclear arms and disarmament control treaties [<http://www.nuclearfiles.org/kinuclearweapons/acindex.html>]*

*Other sources include the **Arms Control Association** [<http://www.armscontrol.org/treaties/>] and the **Carnegie Endowment for International Peace**. [<http://www.ceip.org/files/nonprolif/resources/treaties.asp>]*

[end box]

[begin new box]

### **Moscow Treaty of 2002**

[Photo of President Bush and President Putin signing treaty:

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/president/europe/05.html>

Caption in smaller type: Presidents Bush and Putin sign arms reduction treaty at the Kremlin in Moscow May 24, 2002.

*The latest nuclear arms control treaty is the **Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty** [<http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/sort/index.html>] It is also referred to as the *Moscow Treaty of 2002* because President Bush and President Putin signed the treaty in the Russian capital.*

*According to a White House news release: "The Treaty requires each country to reduce and limit its strategic nuclear warheads to 1700-2200 by December 31, 2012. Each side may determine for itself the composition and structure of its strategic forces consistent with this limit. A Bilateral Implementation Commission will meet at least twice a year to discuss issues related to the Treaty."*

### **Faith Perspective**

*Organizations in the faith community have welcomed the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty as a step in the right direction. However, they have expressed concern that the cuts are not deep enough and that large numbers of warheads will be held in reserve. Their concern relates to anxiety about the Nuclear Posture Review of the Bush Administration, which foresees nuclear weapons forever and envisions expanded use. A sample of this opinion is offered by:*

Church of the Brethren, Washington Office

[http://www.thirdway.com/wv/article.asp?A\\_ID=93&Submit=Go](http://www.thirdway.com/wv/article.asp?A_ID=93&Submit=Go)

Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism

<http://www.rac.org/news/053102.html>

U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops

[<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/tstjul23.htm>]

## Civil Sector Critique

*Civil sector advocates of nuclear disarmament have expressed concern about the lack of a reduction schedule in the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty, the retention of nuclear warheads and delivery vehicles, and the absence of verification measures. For instance, see the views of:*

Arms Control Association [[http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002\\_06/sortanaljune02.asp](http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002_06/sortanaljune02.asp)]

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace

[<http://www.ceip.org/files/nonprolif/templates/article.asp?NewsID=2932>]

Council for a Livable World [<http://www.clw.org/control/sort/clwposition.html>]

Natural Resources Defense Council [<http://www.nrdc.org/nuclear/atreaty02.asp>]

*A broad range of views on the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty was offered at ratification hearings by the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in the summer of 2002.*

[end of box]

[new box]

### **Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty**

*[Graphic in large letters: NPT]*

*The agreement with broadest participation is the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, also referred to as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).*

*[<http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/npt/index.html>] which went into effect in 1970.*

*The NPT represents a bargain between the five acknowledged nuclear-weapon states -- United States, Soviet Union (now Russia), United Kingdom, France, and China -- and the rest of the world. The nuclear-weapon states agreed not to help other states acquire nuclear weapons but to provide assistance for peaceful uses of nuclear energy. They also pledge to move toward nuclear disarmament. In exchange the non-nuclear signatories agreed not to develop nuclear weapons.*

*187 states are parties to the NPT. Only Cuba, Israel, India, and Pakistan are not members.*

*The NPT provides for a Review Conference every five years. Originally the NPT was to be in effect for twenty-five years. At a Review and Extension Conference in 1995 the treaty was extended indefinitely. The five-year Review Conferences continue, preceded by meetings of the NPT Preparatory Commission (PrepCom).*

### **Article VI**

*The obligation of the nuclear-weapon states to work toward nuclear disarmament is specified in Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The text is as follows:*

Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to

nuclear disarmament, and on a Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

*The meaning of Article VI has provoked considerable international discussion and was the focus of a 1996 ruling of the International Court of Justice [[linkage to below](#)] that the nuclear weapon states have an obligation to achieve nuclear disarmament.*

### **Practical Steps**

*Non-nuclear weapon states have pressed the five acknowledged nuclear weapon states to move along with their obligation to achieve nuclear disarmament. The Final Document [<http://www.basicint.org/nuclear/NPT/2000revcon/finaldoc-advance.htm>] of the 2000 NPT Review Conference contains 13 practical steps [<http://www.zero-nukes.org/howtogettozero.html#2000nptreview>] on nuclear disarmament. One of them specifies:*

An unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals leading to nuclear disarmament to which all States parties are committed under Article VI.

[end box]

[new box]

### **International Court of Justice Advisory Opinion**

[logo, or seal, from <http://www.icj-cij.org/icjwww/icj002.htm>]

*In the 1990s several U.S. and international non-governmental organizations undertook the World Court Project [<http://www.lcnp.org/wcourt/index.htm>] to obtain a ruling from the International Court of Justice (ICJ) on the legality of nuclear weapons. The formal request for an advisory opinion came in 1994 from the United Nations General Assembly, which asked,*

Is the threat or use of nuclear weapons in any circumstance permitted under international law?

*After receiving written briefs from many sources and conducting public hearings, the ICJ in 1996 issued an advisory opinion [<http://www.lcnp.org/wcourt/opinion.htm>], stating that the threat or use of nuclear weapons is generally illegal and that states have an obligation to conclude negotiations on their elimination. The Court's specific reply to the question put by the General Assembly is as follows:*

A. Unanimously: There is in neither customary nor conventional international law any specific authorization of the threat or use of nuclear weapons;

B. By eleven votes to three: There is in neither customary nor conventional international law any comprehensive and universal prohibition of the threat or use of nuclear weapons as such;

C. Unanimously: A threat or use of force by means of nuclear weapons that is contrary to Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter and that fails to meet all the requirements of Article 51, is unlawful;

D. Unanimously: A threat or use of nuclear weapons should also be compatible with the requirements of the international law applicable in armed conflict, particularly those of the principles and rules of international humanitarian law, as well as with specific obligations under treaties and other undertakings which expressly deal with nuclear weapons;

E. By seven votes to seven, by the President's casting vote: It follows from the above-mentioned requirements that the threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict, and in particular the principles and rules of humanitarian law;

However, in view of the current state of international law, and of the elements of fact at its disposal, the Court cannot conclude definitively whether the threat or use of nuclear weapons would be lawful or unlawful in an extreme circumstance of self-defence, in which the very survival of a State would be at stake;

F. Unanimously: There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.

[end of box]

[new box]

### **Model Nuclear Weapons Convention**

[take the symbol for Nuclear Weapons Convention from [www:lcnp.org](http://www.lcnp.org)]

*For two other categories of weapons of mass destruction, chemical and biological, there are international conventions to outlaw their use and provide for safeguarding and eliminating existing stockpiles. Many advocates of nuclear disarmament favor a similar nuclear weapons convention.*

*Therefore, following the ruling on the legality of nuclear weapons by the International Court of Justice, the **Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy** [[www.lcnp.org](http://www.lcnp.org)] provide leadership to an international consortium of lawyers, scientists, disarmament experts, physicians and activists to draft a Model Nuclear Weapons Convention [<http://www.lcnp.org/mnwc/convention.htm>]. Released in 1997, this convention outlines procedures to dismantle and destroy all nuclear weapons in a series of graduated steps and to verify compliance with such steps.*

*Subsequently United Nations General Assembly has adopted resolutions calling for negotiations for a nuclear weapons convention.*

[end of box]

## **Other Treaty Proposals**

Under development.



In *Arsenals & Treaties*, strike the following paragraph:

*Historic data on nuclear weapons* [<http://www.nrdc.org/nuclear/nudb/datainx.asp>] is available from the **Natural Resources Defense Council** [[www.nrcd.org](http://www.nrcd.org)].

Replace it with the following:

*Also, each issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists contains a Nuclear Notebook [<http://www.thebulletin.org/issues/nukenotes/nukenote.html>] containing up-to-date facts and figures on the world's nuclear weapons and weapons facilities. This information is provided by Robert S. Norris of the Natural Resources Defense Council and William Arkin.*

<http://www.thebulletin.org/issues/nukenotes/mj02nukenote.pdf>

U.S. Nuclear Forces, 2002

Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons

<http://www.dfat.gov.au/cc/cchome.html>

Executive Summary

[http://www.dfat.gov.au/cc/cc\\_report\\_exec.html](http://www.dfat.gov.au/cc/cc_report_exec.html)

09 January 2002

### **Special Briefing on the Nuclear Posture Review**

<http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/arms/stories/review.htm>

photo of nuclear explosion

<http://www.geocities.com/area51/vault/5862/nukepics.html>

Jonathan Dean  
Adviser on International Security Issues  
Union of Concerned Scientists  
1707 H Street, NW, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: 202-223-6133  
FAX: 202-223-6162  
e-mail: [jdean@ucsusa.org](mailto:jdean@ucsusa.org)

July 15, 2002

## **The Nuclear Weapons Policy of the Bush Administration And Why It Should Frighten You**

This article evaluates the nuclear weapons policy of the Bush administration and its implications for our defense and foreign policy. To start with, it deals with three key questions:

First, how many nuclear weapons will the U.S. have under the administration policy?

Second, how long will the U.S. have nuclear weapons?

And third, what would U.S. nuclear weapons be used for?

The partial answer to this last question, what would U.S. nuclear weapons be used for, is that no recent U.S. administration has foreseen a wider range of situations where U.S. nuclear weapons may be used than the Bush administration. This is one main reason why the administration's nuclear weapons policy should scare you. And there are many other reasons.

But first, how many nuclear weapons will the U.S. have under the policy of the administration, including the Moscow Treaty of May 24, which reflects that policy?

The answer is, not much less than the number we have now, but in different categories of readiness for use.

In the fall of 2000, before the presidential elections, Congress mandated a nuclear posture review by the incoming administration. The review was delivered to Congress on January 8 of this year. A small portion of the Review was made public officially and a large portion was leaked without serious refutation. It is customary and useful for incoming presidents to request government agencies to review the U.S. nuclear arsenal and U.S. nuclear strategy. The usual sequel some time later is a presidential decision document which directs the Defense and Energy Departments to take specific actions.

This time, the incoming Bush administration had radically different ideas about nuclear weapons from past administrations. It believed Russia was no longer a serious threat to the U.S., that U.S. nuclear policy should reflect that evaluation, and also that arms control -- negotiation to limit the risks between possible antagonists -- is archaic and belongs, along with communism, on the trash heap of history.

As the administration was working on the Posture Review, it was primarily concerned about the possibility of missile attack on the United States by rogue states and about the possibility of acts of terrorism. Then came the actual September 11 attacks. At the end of January 2002, the administration merged together these two different threats, rogue states and terrorists, into what it seemed to argue was an active alliance among all of them, an alliance which it called the "axis of evil." Combining these two highly feared threats was an inspired stroke of public presentation. However, there is only limited evidence of the existence of such an alliance.

Today, as the Nuclear Posture Review indicates, the United States has about 8,000 nuclear warheads in the field. About six thousand strategic warheads are operationally deployed. That is, they are attached to long-range missiles ready to fire, or are ready to be loaded on intercontinental bombers. About 1,600 so-called tactical warheads, mostly aircraft bombs, are deployed in a similar way. The United States today also has over 2,000 warheads in a reserve stockpile. This is the so-called "hedge" force established under the Clinton administration as insurance against sudden reversal in newly de-communized Russia. Counting about 1,000 warheads for spares, this gives a total of about 11,000 warheads.

In 2012, when the new Moscow treaty expires, the U.S. will have about 8,000 nuclear warheads, but only 1,700-2,200 strategic warheads will be deployed. Let's add about 1,000 tactical warheads and 500-600 for spares and warheads assigned to submarines in maintenance, which are not to be included in the U.S. total. Beyond this, Secretary of State Powell indicated on July 9 in testifying on the Moscow Treaty that about 2,400 warheads will be in an active responsive reserve, ready to be remounted on delivery vehicles. About 2,000 warheads will be in an inactive reserve, with tritium components and neutron generators removed. The first group, the active reserve, would take from several weeks to several months to be reloaded on delivery systems; the second group would take many months to prepare for use.

In practical terms, one result of the Nuclear Posture Review and of the Moscow Treaty is large-scale "de-alerting" -- removal of warheads from delivery systems and their separate storage to prevent premature use. This action, which has long been urged by Bruce Blair of the Center for Defense Information and by other NGOs, creates additional time to check the facts before launching missiles and reduces the risk of accidental or unauthorized launch of nuclear weapons or of wholesale launch on warning. But these dangers are not eliminated unless the entire force on both sides is de-alerted. This should happen under the Posture Review, but it will not. Instead, unless further action is taken, for the duration of this agreement, thousands of U.S. and Russian warheads will remain on alert. Other thousands of Russian warheads and Russian weapons materials remain scattered around that vast country, with a risk of illegal sale, theft and forcible seizure. Russian nuclear forces, whether operational or open to illegal diversion, remain our greatest nuclear danger -- not the "axis of evil."

Russia did not gain agreement to four points it asked for during the five months of negotiation that led to the May 24 Moscow treaty. The first of these was "transparency," data exchange on stockpiles of strategic nuclear weapons with some verification of their numbers. The second was destruction of reduced warheads, leading to irreversibility of arms reductions. After long resistance on its part, Russia took over these two points from Clinton administration

arms controllers. It is a great pity that this conversion of views was not consolidated through formal agreement with Russia in the May 24 treaty.

The third Russian point was a prohibition against space weapons, a key ABM concept. We will hear much more in the future about the worrying consequences of Russia's failure to gain agreement on this point.

The fourth thing Russia asked for and did not receive was a numerical limit on the number of missile interceptors deployed in the U.S. missile defense program. This limit was the core concept of the ABM Treaty that the administration nullified this past June 13. Without this limit on deployed interceptors, the steady expansion of U.S. missile defenses, which form an important part of the new U.S. nuclear posture, will be a durable engine driving the long-term growth of the world's nuclear arsenals. As the number of deployed U.S. interceptors grows, even if they will not work under attack, there will ultimately be increases in Chinese and Russian nuclear forces to keep up. Indian, Pakistani, and even UK and French nuclear forces will grow to keep up with the Russians and the Chinese. In the end, the U.S. will increase its own nuclear forces. These consequences may be like the progress of a glacier -- very slow. But they will move relentlessly onward.

Owing to the administration's dropping of START II, there is no ban in the Moscow Treaty on MIRVs, multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles -- separate targetable warheads attached to a single missile. Russia can now maintain a higher level of operationally deployed warheads with fewer missiles. Because multiple warhead missiles are a prime target, Moscow is likely to keep its MIRVed missiles on hair-trigger alert, not a healthy situation for the United States. The Moscow treaty also has no provision for destruction of excess missiles and their silos, which has been a solid virtue of the START treaties because missiles and silos can take a long time to replace and install. As a consequence of this deliberate omission and of the U.S. concept of keeping thousands of warheads in an active reserve, which will doubtless be adopted by Russia, both countries can increase their deployed arsenals rapidly and to a large extent, uploading both operational and retained missiles. There will be no limit on the number of warheads each side has as long as they are not operationally deployed.

This capability, combined with the short 90-day period of withdrawal from the treaty and the treaty's expiration on the very day in 2012 when the reduced level is to be achieved undermines nuclear stability and adds to the volatility of the Moscow agreement. The agreement specifies neither the type of reduction to be made by each government nor how progress toward compliance is to be measured. A lot of thought has been given to making this treaty easily reversible and loaded with potential for dangerous disagreements. Despite the seriousness of the problem of tactical nuclear weapons, the two governments failed to tackle it in the Moscow Treaty. Russia has up to 12,000 of these smaller, more portable weapons, and the U.S. about 1,600. These weapons can also be used for strategic attack and they are a prime target for illegal sale or seizure.

The second question, How long will we have nuclear weapons?

Article VI of the 1970 Non-Proliferation Treaty commits the United States and the other permanent members of the Security Council to eliminate their entire nuclear arsenals. In a 1996 advisory opinion -- this point was unanimous and included U.S. judge Steven Schwebel -- the International Court of Justice in the Hague stated that this NPT obligation remains binding and that the weapon states should proceed to fulfill it.

But under the 2002 Nuclear Posture Review, the U.S. nuclear arsenal is planned to be with us for the next half century and beyond. The Review foresees comprehensive modernization of the entire U.S. nuclear weapons complex. This starts with development of three new nuclear warheads: a deep penetrating warhead, perhaps two of them, a nuclear and a conventional version; a so-called Agent Defeat weapon that can neutralize and destroy chemical and biological weapons (this too could be in conventional and nuclear versions); and low-yield mini-nukes.

These new nuclear weapons will have to be tested. The Posture Review says nuclear testing may have to be resumed at some future point and has ordered a shorter preparation time for the Nevada Test Site.

In fact, after nullifying the ABM Treaty and dealing a body blow to the Biological Weapons Convention by withdrawing from verification negotiations, the administration seems to be moving slowly but deliberately toward dismantling a third key structure of multilateral arms control, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. One problem here is that if the U.S. can withdraw from multilateral arms control treaties, other governments can too.

As regards testing, the computer and engineering work for new warheads is under way, the test site is being prepared, concerns are being expressed by the weapons laboratories and the administration about the aging of the current nuclear stockpile and the Stockpile Stewardship Program, which is designed to assure its effectiveness. The administration seems to be waiting only for a precipitating incident to justify recommencement of testing.

The administration's comprehensive nuclear weapons modernization program includes a new plant to produce tritium gas; a new warhead assembly plant; rebuilding a plant for uranium weapon components; a new land-based intercontinental missile; a new submarine-based missile; a new missile firing submarine; and a new strategic bomber. The new submarine is due by 2030, the new bomber by 2040.

The May 24 treaty does refer in passing to Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Perhaps the Russians are responsible for this reference. But there is no mention in the Posture Review of the long-term prospect of eliminating nuclear weapons. The administration view is unambiguous, that nuclear weapons are with us forever. Taking together the expansionary effects of unlimited missile defense on nuclear arsenals and this comprehensive modernization program, the administration may be right about that. But what has happened to the pledge, implicit in the Non-Proliferation treaty, that, when the cold war nuclear confrontation ended, the U.S. would make a serious effort to move to elimination of its nuclear weapons?

### The third question, What would U.S. nuclear weapons be used for?

Over the years, the norm has emerged that nuclear weapons should be used only in response to the threat or use of nuclear weapons. Perhaps this concept was more a hope of the Canberra Commission and of non-nuclear states for the post Cold War period than a norm, because it was not official U.S. policy. NATO doctrine foresaw possible use of nuclear weapons in the face of overwhelming Soviet conventional attack in Europe. This danger dissolved with withdrawal of Soviet troops from Eastern Europe and the collapse of the Soviet Union, but, after a promising initial move to consider nuclear weapons as weapons of last resort, NATO has not fundamentally changed its first-use policy, mainly, despite the views of the majority of NATO governments, in order to maintain conformity with the first-use policy of the United States.

The Clinton administration, faced by new fears of rogue missile attack, adopted a policy of deliberate ambiguity, hinting but not confirming that it would consider response with nuclear weapons if attacked by chemical or biological as well as by nuclear weapons. In the administration's Nuclear Posture Review, this ambiguity is stripped away. The Review is explicit that, henceforth, U.S. nuclear weapons may be used in response to nuclear, chemical, biological or conventional attack. Beyond that, the number and type of situations in which nuclear weapons may be used has been considerably expanded. In the words of the Review, nuclear strike forces are to be prepared to deal with "immediate contingencies," like an Iraqi attack on Israel, a North Korean attack on South Korea, or a military confrontation over Taiwan. Strike forces might also be used to deal with "potential contingencies," like emergence of a new hostile coalition against the U.S. -- presumably headed by China; nuclear forces could be used to deal with a third category of "unexpected contingencies," sudden and unpredicted security challenges. Taken together, these form a very broad spectrum of situations in which U.S. nuclear weapons might be used.

The Posture Review suggests that new long-range conventional weapons be developed for use instead of nuclear weapons in some situations. While this is in one sense a positive decision, it blurs the distinction between the two types of weapons because it suggests that nuclear and conventional weapons belong on the same unbroken continuum.

In the Nuclear Posture Review, the circle of target countries, those kept under constant targeting, has also been expanded. In addition to Russia, which remains targeted in spite of our improved relations, and China, the targeted countries now include Libya, Syria, Iraq, Iran and North Korea. With the possible exception of Iraq, which violated its NPT commitment, these countries are non-nuclear states which remain covered by U.S. negative security guarantees in connection with the Non-Proliferation Treaty not to use nuclear weapons against non-weapon states unless they are allied with an attacking weapon state. Targeting these countries is a case of deliberate inconsistency on the part of the United States. Especially for the non-nuclear states that are party to the Nonproliferation Treaty, it raises a serious question about what U.S. commitments are worth.

All in all, the range of situations and target countries in which the United States would consider use of nuclear weapons has been considerably expanded for the Policy Review. As a



consequence, the nuclear threshold, the point at which a United States administration would begin to seriously examine the possibility of using nuclear weapons, has been significantly lowered. The end result here is very far from a policy of nuclear weapons as a weapon of last resort. This is an aggressively forward-leaning threat of early first use. The fact that Russia has similarly broad views adds to the risk that nuclear weapons will actually be used.

It must be a source of real concern that the United States, a country which has huge conventional military superiority over all other countries of the world, and which has in addition huge diplomatic and economic resources, should now envision so many potential uses for nuclear weapons. It is unsettling that this is happening in a situation where the danger of total national destruction through all-out attack by nuclear or biological weapons has largely passed, and the United States is now concerned by the very different possibility of a localized rogue state or terrorist attack which could be very serious, but whose effects can be contained with proper preparation.

\*\*\*

A final question, what kind of world will this new nuclear weapon strategy be operating in?

Viewed objectively, the U.S. is faced by a deteriorating proliferation situation. In the 1990s, nuclear non-proliferation failed in Iraq and nearly failed in North Korea. Then it failed in Pakistan and India. Missile proliferation has expanded, with exports from North Korea and China, and with North Korea, India, Pakistan and Iran building new missiles. This is the situation the Nuclear Policy Review seeks to deal with.

Quite rightly, President Bush takes proliferation seriously. He is determined to deal with the main threats to the U.S. population, threats which he sees as terrorist attacks or rogue missile attacks. It may be that the President hopes to go down in history as the American leader who decisively ended these threats. As he originally said before the negative connotations of this word for Muslims became clear for him, this is a crusade, a crusade involving the whole nation. As part of this effort, the President is trying to make the threat of use of American nuclear weapons more credible and more terrifying. He is also threatening to strike unilaterally at proliferators instead of leading an intense international effort to get on top of this proliferation situation and to control it. Using armed force against proliferators may be necessary in exceptional circumstances. But it should be joint action. Convincing other governments to join in such enterprises may be difficult but it can be done, as the older President Bush proved in the Gulf War and as President Clinton proved with NATO members in Kosovo. Moreover, the administration's solo approach on this and other issues is leaching away the reserves of gratitude, respect, and shared views which the U.S. has with much sacrifice built up over the past half-century.

We do not have access to the stream of secret information that shapes the President's views, but the administration's war against terrorism seems to reflect both the President's genuine personal convictions and a deliberate administration effort to maintain public concerns over terrorist attacks at a high level in order to support the war on terrorism.

Now, in his June 1, 2002 West Point speech, the President has publicly announced a concept of preemptive action against possible proliferators. This concept is questionable on practical and moral grounds. Nonetheless, the administration has indicated that this concept will form part of an overall National Security Strategy now being drafted. It is probable that only future historians will see the text of this document, and then only after its damage has been done. In addition to other important problems, preemptive attack depends on reliable intelligence that there is an immediate threat. The consequences of error could be very serious and often are, as the July, 2002 U.S. attack on an Afghan wedding party demonstrates. However, according to press reports, Secretary Rumsfeld speaking at NATO on June 6 said that the Alliance could not wait for "absolute proof" before a preemptive attack is launched. Preemptive use of weapons, possibly including nuclear weapons, on the basis of incomplete evidence is a very disquieting prospect.

It is legitimate to act preemptively in self defense in the face of a specific, imminent and evident challenge. But the new U.S. doctrine is general rather than specific. It refers to a whole class of potential offenders, the governments and terrorist groups that may be participating in the axis of evil.

There is an unevaluated and probably incorrect assumption in the preemption approach that all these target countries would try to attack the United States and its allies as soon as they are able. However, it is not legitimate to threaten early use of weapons, possibly including nuclear weapons, when threats from others are not pressing or evident and may not become so. It is not legitimate to threaten early use of weapons when approaches of diplomacy and negotiation are either untried or not exhausted.

In the cold war nuclear confrontation, preemption or even the appearance of possible preemptive action was regarded as something which must be avoided because it could trigger a full nuclear exchange. Its use today could still bring serious counterattack. Preemption is also not legitimate or moral if the actual political or military objective is broader than the announced target of preemption. This could be the situation with regard to Iraq, where the ostensible objective would be to block imminent attack on the U.S. or its allies, but the actual objective would be regime change. Preemption as a general policy is the essence of U.S. unilateralism. It is a generalized threat that the U.S. will decide for itself when to take drastic action when its information, whose details must remain secret, indicates that preemptive attack may be useful. Because a policy of preemption has no congressional authorization although it indicates unannounced warlike action against a wide range of states and groups, it has an unconstitutional quality.

It was not force of arms, but diplomacy and sanctions that brought the North Korean regime to the negotiating table. We can still talk to the Syrian, Libyan and Iranian governments, and even to the Iraqi government, and frame requirements and inducements.

Now that military action in Afghanistan has ended the Taliban regime, Saddam Hussein is first on the administration's destruct list. For a while, it appeared that there might be a long way to travel before this goal can be reached. First, the India-Pakistan confrontation has had to

be calmed. The effort to do this is underway. Then the Arab-Israeli confrontation had to be mitigated. And then must come renewed UN inspections in Iraq.

The administration's June 25 proposal that Arafat be removed before negotiating a possible resolution of the Palestinian-Israeli confrontation provides grounds for U.S. inaction on this issue until after the November U.S. elections. In terms of U.S. public opinion, this development may put military action against Iraq back on track. In any event, some specific administration decision on what actually to do about Iraq cannot be delayed much beyond the November elections. Without damage to its credibility, the administration cannot continually proclaim Saddam to be public enemy number one, and then fail to take decisive action against him.

### What It All Means

What this all amounts to is that we are talking ourselves into war with Iraq using preemptive means. At least three countries involved in the Iraqi confrontation -- the U.S., possibly Iraq itself, and Israel -- have weapons of mass destruction. Perhaps preemption as now being considered by the administration refers to use of conventional forces. Perhaps the public announcement of a preemption policy is a deliberate tactic intended to add to pressures on Saddam Hussein. Nonetheless, preemption means first use of military force. With Iraq, Iran, and North Korea on the administration's nuclear target list, there is an unavoidable, in fact presumably desired, implication that preemption could include nuclear weapons.

To summarize, except in cases of immediately evident danger, preemption is the essence of unilateralism in foreign policy. Preemptive military action is immoral in causing loss of life without full prior exploration of alternatives to the use of force. If carried out without prior consultation with the Congress and the American public, including public presentation and discussion of convincing evidence, it is behavior which we would term authoritarian if other governments engaged in it. Where is the administration's insistence on tough, effective, continuing inspections in Iraq which will either produce that convincing evidence of Saddam Hussein's aggressive WMD activities or restrict his ability to produce or deliver these weapons?

The net result of these moves, of the administration's lowering of the nuclear threshold, its indefinite postponement of elimination of nuclear weapons, its nearly exclusive focus on military solutions, its bellicose vocabulary, its support for preemptive attack, and of the fact that the administration implausibly sees terrorists supplied by rogue nations ready to attack the United States with WMD in locations all over the globe, is that the situations in which Washington may be prepared to use nuclear weapons are becoming increasingly numerous.

As a consequence, people all over the world, as well as the terrorists and rogue state governments who are the presumed targets of these policies, have become frightened about the future and about what the United States might do.

This is not the responsible leadership on nuclear weapons policy that we and the rest of the world hope for from the United States. The assessment seems unavoidable that, instead, it is nuclear bullying -- counterproductive, dangerous, and immoral.

There is in fact a risk in the overheated atmosphere of the war on terrorism that things could get out of control in Iraq, in Israel, or in Pakistan, where an unstable nuclear regime is vulnerable to a coup by military or Islamic extremists. Of these problems, the Pakistan situation alone is a source of danger to the United States and the world that overshadows the dangers of the "axis of evil," but it is receiving insufficient emphasis in U.S. policy. In all these hot spots, India-Pakistan, the Palestinian-Israeli confrontation, in Iran, North Korea -- and also in Iraq -- the United States should give diplomacy and negotiation, backed by international cooperation, a full opportunity before considering the use of force.

Those of us who are alarmed at these developments in U.S. policy must speak up and raise our voices. It is only through more questions and more critical evaluation that the American public, which has instinctively rallied around national leadership in an emergency situation, will begin to raise its own necessary questions.

## ICJ Advisory Opinion

<http://www.lcnp.org/wcourt/opinion.htm>

The ICJ ruled that the threat or use of nuclear weapons is generally illegal, and that states have an obligation to conclude negotiations on their elimination.

<http://www.basicint.org/nuclear/NPT/2000revcon/finaldoc-advance.htm>

105. For these reasons,

THE COURT,

(1) By thirteen votes to one,

*Decides to comply with the request for an advisory opinion;*

IN FAVOUR: *President Bedjaoui; Vice-President Schwebel; Judges Guillaume, Shahabuddeen, Weeramantry, Ranjeva, Herczegh, Shi, Fleischhauer, Koroma, Vereshchetin, Ferrari Bravo, Higgins;*

AGAINST: *Judge Oda.*

(2) *Replies* in the following manner to the question put by the General Assembly:

A. Unanimously,

There is in neither customary nor conventional international law any specific authorization of the threat or use of nuclear weapons;

B. By eleven votes to three,

There is in neither customary nor conventional international law any comprehensive and universal prohibition of the threat or use of nuclear weapons as such;

IN FAVOUR: *President Bedjaoui; Vice-President Schwebel; Judges Oda, Guillaume, Ranjeva, Herczegh, Shi, Fleischhauer, Vereshchetin, Ferrari Bravo, Higgins;*

AGAINST: *Judges Shahabuddeen, Weeramantry, Koroma.*

C. Unanimously,

A threat or use of force by means of nuclear weapons that is contrary to Article 2, paragraph 4, of the United Nations Charter and that fails to meet all the requirements of Article 51, is unlawful;

D. Unanimously,

A threat or use of nuclear weapons should also be compatible with the requirements of the international law applicable in armed conflict, particularly those of the principles and rules of international humanitarian law, as well as with specific obligations under treaties and other undertakings which expressly deal with nuclear weapons;

E. By seven votes to seven, by the President's casting vote,

It follows from the above-mentioned requirements that the threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict, and in particular the principles and rules of humanitarian law;

However, in view of the current state of international law, and of the elements of fact at its disposal, the Court cannot conclude definitively whether the threat or use of nuclear weapons would be lawful or unlawful in an extreme circumstance of self-defence, in which the very survival of a State would be at stake;

IN FAVOUR: *President* Bedjaoui; *Judges* Ranjeva, Herczegh, Shi, Fleischhauer, Vereschetin, Ferrari Bravo;

AGAINST: *Vice-President* Schwebel; *Judges* Oda, Guillaume, Shahabuddeen, Weeramantry, Koroma, Higgins.

F. Unanimously,

There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.

Done in English and in French, the English text being authoritative, at the Peace Palace, The Hague, this eighth day of July, one thousand nine hundred and ninety-six, in two copies, one of which will be placed in the archives of the Court and the other transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

(*Signed*) Mohammed BEDJAOU, President.

---

**Nuclear Weapons Convention**: Statement of Purpose and Summary of the MNWC

## **Table of Contents**

### **A. Statement of Purpose**

1. [Introduction](#)
2. [Rationale for Elimination of Nuclear Weapons](#)
3. [Obligation to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons](#)
4. [The Comprehensive Approach](#)
5. [The Negotiation Process](#)
6. [Political Will](#)

### **B. Table of Contents of the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention**

### **C. Draft Preamble**

### **D. Summaries of Key Provisions of the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention**

## **Appendices**

- I. U.N. General Assembly Resolution 51/45 M, Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice, 1996
- II. U.N. General Assembly Resolution 50/70 P, Nuclear Disarmament, 1995
- III. Dispositif of the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons, 1996

## **A. Statement of Purpose**

### **1. Introduction**

In February 1996 the Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy established a committee of lawyers, academics, scientists, disarmament experts and diplomats to begin the drafting of a Model Nuclear Weapons Convention (NWC), which would prohibit the development, production, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use and threat of use of nuclear weapons and provide for their elimination.

The aim of the Model NWC is to demonstrate the feasibility of the elimination of nuclear weapons through such an international agreement. It is intended to stimulate negotiations by States on the elimination of nuclear weapons, and to provide guidance and focus for such negotiations. In addition, establishing a framework for the elimination of nuclear weapons, will assist in achieving steps towards that goal.

A large number of citizens' organizations are supportive of, or participating in this effort, including the Abolition 2000 Network, comprised of over 600 organizations worldwide, which calls for the negotiation and conclusion of a Nuclear Weapons Convention by the year 2000.

This document discusses the rationale for nuclear abolition, the desirability of a comprehensive approach, alternative processes for negotiation of a NWC and the necessity of developing political will for such negotiations. It includes a draft Preamble and an Outline of the draft Model NWC.

<http://www.lcnp.org/mnwc/convention.htm>

## Indecent Explosives\*

by Carah Ong

### Here are the Nuclear Weapons States, Who They Are And How Many Weapons Each Possesses

Estimates of the global nuclear stockpile range from a low of **24,700 to 33,307** suspected nuclear weapons. Below is a country by country breakdown of nuclear stockpiles.-

#### **Declared Nuclear Weapons States (5)**

**China:** China has 290 suspected strategic nuclear weapons, with an emphasis on land-based missiles, and 120 non-strategic nuclear weapons for a suspected total of **400-410** nuclear weapons. China currently has only one working ballistic missile submarine. Information about China's tactical nuclear weapons is limited and there is no official evidence of their existence.

**France:** France has an estimated total of **400-482** strategic nuclear weapons. The French arsenal is currently under a widespread modernization, including its sea-based deterrent force. In January 2000, France deployed a second Triumphant class submarine and a third is expected to enter into service in 2001. France also plans to deploy two more by 2007. Each submarine carries 16 missiles with 6 nuclear warheads on each.

**Russia\*\*:** Russia has 6,000 suspected strategic nuclear weapons and between 7,000 and 15,000 suspected non-strategic nuclear weapons for a suspected total of some **13,000-20,000** nuclear weapons. Although Russia has made dramatic reductions since the end of the Cold War, some nuclear modernization continues. In 2000, the Russian Duma signed and ratified START II, however, its entrance into force is dependent on US plans to deploy a national missile defense (NMD) system. Also, President Vladimir Putin made an offer to US President Bill Clinton to reduce strategic weapons to 1,000-1,500 each, a number below proposed START III levels of 2,000-2,500. Russia maintains some 2,000-2,500 nuclear weapons on high-alert status, ready to launch at a moment's notice.

**United Kingdom:** The United Kingdom's nuclear capability has been concentrated on its Trident submarine fleet under the command of the British Royal Navy. The submarines are powered by nuclear reactors and the missiles in the UK Trident submarines are leased from the US. British nuclear weapons are incorporated into NATO strategic planning and are dependent on targeting information from the US. According to the UK Strategic Defense Review, there is always "one submarine on patrol at a time, carrying a reduced load of **48** warheads." There are **58** missiles in service and a "stockpile of less than **200** operationally available warheads." Each warhead has an explosive yield of 100 kilotons, which is approximately 5 times the destructive power of the plutonium bomb dropped on Nagasaki.



**United States\*\*:** The United States has 7,300 suspected strategic nuclear weapons and between 4,700 and 11,700 suspected non-strategic nuclear weapons for a suspected total of **10,500-12,000** nuclear weapons. The US is the only country to station land-based nuclear weapons outside of its borders. Nuclear modernization continues in the US with scheduled modifications on B-2's and sea-launched ballistic missiles. The US also has aggressive plans to deploy a national missile defense (NMD) system, despite warnings from Russia, China and even some allies that such a system will initiate a new arms race. Like Russia, the US also maintains some 2,000-2,500 nuclear weapons on "hair-trigger" alert, ready to launch at a moment's notice. Although the Department of Defense (DoD) claims that these weapons are not targeted at any specific country, the missiles can be assigned a target on short notice.

### **Defacto Nuclear Weapons States (3)**

**India:** India has a suspected stockpile of separated weapons-grade plutonium to produce at least **85 to 90** weapons. It also has a ballistic missile submarine, "Sagarika," under development with aid from Russia.

**Israel:** Israel has enough estimated weapons-grade fissile material to produce **100** suspected nuclear weapons. Israel also has three Dolphin class submarines and is reportedly developing submarine-launched cruise missile (SLCM) capability.

**Pakistan:** Pakistan has a suspected capability of between **15 and 25** complete but unassembled nuclear weapons that could be quickly readied for use.

### **Potential Nuclear Weapons States**

**Iran:** Iran is suspected to be actively pursuing a nuclear weapons program, but as of yet is not considered to have nuclear weapons capability.

**Iraq:** Iraq is suspected to be actively pursuing a nuclear weapons program, but as of yet is not considered to have nuclear weapons capability.

**Libya:** Libya has a *theoretical* capability of delivering nuclear weapons in the form of Scud and FROG missiles and missiles delivered by medium-range Tu-22 bombers.

**North Korea:** According to US, Chinese and Russian intelligence sources, North Korea has as many as **10** operational nuclear warheads for its missiles and **two** nuclear devices that can be carried by truck , boat or aircraft.

The remaining countries in the world have **NO** nuclear weapons. There are **433 nuclear reactors** worldwide. There are 44 countries with nuclear reactors. Any country with a nuclear reactor is considered to have the capability to produce nuclear weapons.

\*Revised January 2001.

\*\*Estimated totals for US and Russia warheads include those in active, operational forces as well as retired, non-deployed warheads awaiting dismantlement and weapons in reserve.

[home](#) | [introduction](#) | [resources](#) | [key issues](#)  
[timeline](#) | [biographies](#) | [ethics](#) | [educators](#)  
[support](#) | [search](#) | [contact us](#)

© Copyright 2001 [Nuclear Age Peace Foundation](#)  
Reproduction of material from this site is encouraged.  
Please acknowledge source and provide  
Foundation [contact information](#) in all copies

## Indecent Explosives\*

by Carah Ong

### Here are the Nuclear Weapons States, Who They Are And How Many Weapons Each Possesses

Estimates of the global nuclear stockpile range from a low of **24,700 to 33,307** suspected nuclear weapons. Below is a country by country breakdown of nuclear stockpiles.-

#### Declared Nuclear Weapons States (5)

**China:** China has 290 suspected strategic nuclear weapons, with an emphasis on land-based missiles, and 120 non-strategic nuclear weapons for a suspected total of **400-410** nuclear weapons. China currently has only one working ballistic missile submarine. Information about China's tactical nuclear weapons is limited and there is no official evidence of their existence.

**France:** France has an estimated total of **400-482** strategic nuclear weapons. The French arsenal is currently under a widespread modernization, including its sea-based deterrent force. In January 2000, France deployed a second Triomphant class submarine and a third is expected to enter into service in 2001. France also plans to deploy two more by 2007. Each submarine carries 16 missiles with 6 nuclear warheads on each.

**Russia\*\*:** Russia has 6,000 suspected strategic nuclear weapons and between 7,000 and 15,000 suspected non-strategic nuclear weapons for a suspected total of some **13,000-20,000** nuclear weapons. Although Russia has made dramatic reductions since the end of the Cold War, some nuclear modernization continues. In 2000, the Russian Duma signed and ratified START II, however, its entrance into force is dependent on US plans to deploy a national missile defense (NMD) system. Also, President Vladimir Putin made an offer to US President Bill Clinton to reduce strategic weapons to 1,000-1,500 each, a number below proposed START III levels of 2,000-2,500. Russia maintains some 2,000-2,500 nuclear weapons on high-alert status, ready to launch at a moment's notice.

**United Kingdom:** The United Kingdom's nuclear capability has been concentrated on its Trident submarine fleet under the command of the British Royal Navy. The submarines are powered by nuclear reactors and the missiles in the UK Trident submarines are leased from the US. British nuclear weapons are incorporated

into NATO strategic planning and are dependent on targeting information from the US. According to the UK Strategic Defense Review, there is always "one submarine on patrol at a time, carrying a reduced load of **48** warheads." There are **58** missiles in service and a "stockpile of less than **200** operationally available warheads." Each warhead has an explosive yield of 100 kilotons, which is approximately 5 times the destructive power of the plutonium bomb dropped on Nagasaki.

**United States\*\*:** The United States has 7,300 suspected strategic nuclear weapons and between 4,700 and 11,700 suspected non-strategic nuclear weapons for a suspected total of **10,500-12,000** nuclear weapons. The US is the only country to station land-based nuclear weapons outside of its borders. Nuclear modernization continues in the US with scheduled modifications on B-2's and sea-launched ballistic missiles. The US also has aggressive plans to deploy a national missile defense (NMD) system, despite warnings from Russia, China and even some allies that such a system will initiate a new arms race. Like Russia, the US also maintains some 2,000-2,500 nuclear weapons on "hair-trigger" alert, ready to launch at a moment's notice. Although the Department of Defense (DoD) claims that these weapons are not targeted at any specific country, the missiles can be assigned a target on short notice.

### **Defacto Nuclear Weapons States (3)**

**India:** India has a suspected stockpile of separated weapons-grade plutonium to produce at least **85 to 90** weapons. It also has a ballistic missile submarine, "Sagarika," under development with aid from Russia.

**Israel:** Israel has enough estimated weapons-grade fissile material to produce **100** suspected nuclear weapons. Israel also has three Dolphin class submarines and is reportedly developing submarine-launched cruise missile (SLCM) capability.

**Pakistan:** Pakistan has a suspected capability of between **15 and 25** complete but unassembled nuclear weapons that could be quickly readied for use.

### **Potential Nuclear Weapons States**

**Iran:** Iran is suspected to be actively pursuing a nuclear weapons program, but as of yet is not considered to have nuclear weapons capability.

**Iraq:** Iraq is suspected to be actively pursuing a nuclear weapons program, but as of yet is not considered to have nuclear weapons capability.

**Libya:** Libya has a *theoretical* capability of delivering nuclear weapons in the form of Scud and FROG missiles and missiles delivered by medium-range Tu-22 bombers.

**North Korea:** According to US, Chinese and Russian intelligence sources, North Korea has as many as **10** operational nuclear warheads for its missiles and **two** nuclear devices that can be

carried by truck , boat or aircraft.

The remaining countries in the world have **NO** nuclear weapons. There are **433 nuclear reactors** worldwide. There are 44 countries with nuclear reactors. Any country with a nuclear reactor is considered to have the capability to produce nuclear weapons.

\*Revised January 2001.

\*\*Estimated totals for US and Russia warheads include those in active, operational forces as well as retired, non-deployed warheads awaiting dismantlement and weapons in reserve.

[home](#) | [introduction](#) | [resources](#) | [key issues](#)  
[timeline](#) | [biographies](#) | [ethics](#) | [educators](#)  
[support](#) | [search](#) | [contact us](#)

© Copyright 2001 [Nuclear Age Peace Foundation](#)  
Reproduction of material from this site is encouraged.  
Please acknowledge source and provide  
Foundation [contact information](#) in all copies

## Indecent Explosives\*

by Carah Ong

**Here are the Nuclear Weapons States, Who They Are And How Many Weapons Each Possesses**

Estimates of the global nuclear stockpile range from a low of **24,700 to 33,307** suspected nuclear weapons. Below is a country by country breakdown of nuclear stockpiles.-

### **Declared Nuclear Weapons States (5)**

**China:** China has 290 suspected strategic nuclear weapons, with an emphasis on land-based missiles, and 120 non-strategic nuclear weapons for a suspected total of **400-410** nuclear weapons. China currently has only one working ballistic missile submarine.

Information about China's tactical nuclear weapons is limited and there is no official evidence of their existence.

**France:** France has an estimated total of **400-482** strategic nuclear weapons. The French arsenal is currently under a widespread modernization, including its sea-based deterrent force. In January 2000, France deployed a second Triomphant class submarine and a third is expected to enter into service in 2001. France also plans to deploy two more by 2007. Each submarine carries 16 missiles with 6 nuclear warheads on each.

**Russia\*\*:** Russia has 6,000 suspected strategic nuclear weapons and between 7,000 and 15,000 suspected non-strategic nuclear weapons for a suspected total of some **13,000-20,000** nuclear weapons. Although Russia has made dramatic reductions since the end of the Cold War, some nuclear modernization continues. In 2000, the Russian Duma signed and ratified START II, however, its entrance into force is dependent on US plans to deploy a national missile defense (NMD) system. Also, President Vladimir Putin made an offer to US President Bill Clinton to reduce strategic weapons to 1,000-1,500 each, a number below proposed START

III levels of 2,000-2,500. Russia maintains some 2,000-2,500 nuclear weapons on high-alert status, ready to launch at a moment's notice.

**United Kingdom:** The United Kingdom's nuclear capability has been concentrated on its Trident submarine fleet under the command of the British Royal Navy. The submarines are powered by nuclear reactors and the missiles in the UK Trident submarines are leased from the US. British nuclear weapons are incorporated into NATO strategic planning and are dependent on targeting information from the US. According to the UK Strategic Defense Review, there is always "one submarine on patrol at a time, carrying a reduced load of **48** warheads." There are **58** missiles in service and a "stockpile of less than **200** operationally available warheads." Each warhead has an explosive yield of 100 kilotons, which is approximately 5 times the destructive power of the plutonium bomb dropped on Nagasaki.

**United States\*\*:** The United States has 7,300 suspected strategic nuclear weapons and between 4,700 and 11,700 suspected non-strategic nuclear weapons for a suspected total of **10,500-12,000** nuclear weapons. The US is the only country to station land-based nuclear weapons outside of its borders. Nuclear modernization continues in the US with scheduled modifications on B-2's and sea-launched ballistic missiles. The US also has aggressive plans to deploy a national missile defense (NMD) system, despite warnings from Russia, China and even some allies that such a system will initiate a new arms race. Like Russia, the US also maintains some 2,000-2,500 nuclear weapons on "hair-trigger" alert, ready to launch at a moment's notice. Although the Department of Defense (DoD) claims that these weapons are not targeted at any specific country, the missiles can be assigned a target on short notice.

### **Defacto Nuclear Weapons States (3)**

**India:** India has a suspected stockpile of separated weapons-grade plutonium to produce at least **85 to 90** weapons. It also has a ballistic missile submarine, "Sagarika," under development with aid from Russia.

**Israel:** Israel has enough estimated weapons-grade fissile material to produce **100** suspected nuclear weapons. Israel also has three Dolphin class submarines and is reportedly developing submarine-launched cruise missile (SLCM) capability.

**Pakistan:** Pakistan has a suspected capability of between **15 and 25** complete but unassembled nuclear weapons that could be quickly readied for use.

### **Potential Nuclear Weapons States**

**Iran:** Iran is suspected to be actively pursuing a nuclear weapons program, but as of yet is not considered to have nuclear weapons capability.

**Iraq:** Iraq is suspected to be actively pursuing a nuclear weapons

program, but as of yet is not considered to have nuclear weapons capability.

**Libya:** Libya has a *theoretical* capability of delivering nuclear weapons in the form of Scud and FROG missiles and missiles delivered by medium-range Tu-22 bombers.

**North Korea:** According to US, Chinese and Russian intelligence sources, North Korea has as many as **10** operational nuclear warheads for its missiles and **two** nuclear devices that can be carried by truck , boat or aircraft.

The remaining countries in the world have **NO** nuclear weapons. There are **433 nuclear reactors** worldwide. There are 44 countries with nuclear reactors. Any country with a nuclear reactor is considered to have the capability to produce nuclear weapons.

\*Revised January 2001.

\*\*Estimated totals for US and Russia warheads include those in active, operational forces as well as retired, non-deployed warheads awaiting dismantlement and weapons in reserve.

[home](#) | [introduction](#) | [resources](#) | [key issues](#)  
[timeline](#) | [biographies](#) | [ethics](#) | [educators](#)  
[support](#) | [search](#) | [contact us](#)

© Copyright 2001 [Nuclear Age Peace Foundation](#)  
Reproduction of material from this site is encouraged.  
Please acknowledge source and provide  
Foundation [contact information](#) in all copies

[home](#) | [introduction](#) | [resources](#) | [key issues](#)  
[timeline](#) | [biographies](#) | [ethics](#) | [educators](#)  
[support](#) | [search](#) | [contact us](#)

© Copyright 2001 [Nuclear Age Peace Foundation](#)  
Reproduction of material from this site is encouraged.  
Please acknowledge source and provide  
Foundation [contact information](#) in all copies

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, also referred to as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), obligates the five acknowledged nuclear-weapon states (the United States, Russian Federation, United Kingdom, France, and China) not to transfer nuclear weapons, other nuclear explosive devices, or their technology to any non-nuclear-weapon state. Non-nuclear-weapon States Parties undertake not to acquire or produce nuclear weapons or nuclear explosive devices. They are required also to accept safeguards to detect diversions of nuclear materials from peaceful activities, such as power generation, to the production of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. This must be done in accordance with an individual safeguards agreement, concluded between each non-nuclear-weapon State Party and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Under these agreements, all nuclear materials in peaceful civil facilities under the jurisdiction of the state must be declared to the IAEA, whose inspectors have routine access to the facilities for periodic monitoring and inspections. If information from routine inspections is not sufficient to fulfill its responsibilities, the IAEA may consult with the state regarding special inspections within or outside declared facilities.

#### **Article VI**

Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

## **Exposing the U.S. Nuclear War Plan**

**NRDC's nuclear war simulation provides an open, independent assessment of the U.S. nuclear war plan, and shows it is a Cold War relic in need of major reform.**

From movies like *Dr. Strangelove* and *War Games* to folk anthems like Dylan's "Masters of War," Cold War pop culture is full of chilling depictions of nuclear war planners at their secret arithmetic. The disturbing truth is that the real American war plan for attacking Russia -- the SIOP, or Single Integrated Operational Plan -- has always been shrouded in impenetrable secrecy. The plan exerts enormous influence over weapons programs and arms control debates, yet is beyond the reach of all but a handful of military planners. Even presidents have been largely unable to influence it.

The NRDC nuclear war plans project uses a computer simulation to reveal what nuclear conflict would look like if it occurred today. The project shows that while the Cold War is long over, American nuclear war plans have hardly changed at all. The war plan still requires some 2,600 warheads to be on alert and trained on Russian targets at all times.

NRDC's simulation will allow those outside of the "nuclear priesthood" to examine the nuclear war planning process. The result of that open analysis, we believe, should be the elimination of SIOP in its current form -- a giant step that permits deeper nuclear arms reductions and a less risky global future.

<http://www.nrdc.org/nuclear/nwarplan.asp>



Model Nuclear Weapons Convention  
<http://www.lcnp.org/mnwc/mnwcsumm.htm#D>

The following is one proposed scenario for phased elimination of nuclear weapons:

All production of nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons usable material would cease on the date of entry into force. Thereafter the following phases would apply:

- i) Within [one] year[s] of entry into force, all nuclear weapons would be taken off alert status. All warheads would be removed from delivery vehicles. Each State Party would submit to the Agency plans for the implementation of its obligations under the Convention.
- ii) Within [two] years of entry into force, all nuclear warheads would be removed from delivery vehicles, all nuclear weapons would be disabled, including the removal of trigger mechanisms. Production, research, and testing facilities would be closed or converted.
- iii) Within [five] years of entry into force, the nuclear weapons of Russia and U.S. would be reduced to a fixed number of warheads or less, with proportional reductions by other Nuclear Weapons States. Nuclear weapons delivery vehicles would be destroyed or converted for purposes not prohibited under the Convention.
- iv) Within [10] years of entry into force there would be further significant cuts in the number of nuclear weapons of all Nuclear Weapons States. All reactors using highly enriched uranium would be closed or converted to reactors using low enriched uranium. All nuclear weapons usable material would be placed under strict, effective and exclusive international control. In addition, all reactors using plutonium as fuel would be closed or converted to reactors that do not use any weapons grade material.
- v) Within [15] years of entry into force, all nuclear weapons would be destroyed and the Agency's role in carrying out the objectives of the Convention would be reviewed and adjusted as appropriate.



**24:7** · This is the **anti-nuclear emblem** or the **peace sign**. It can be seen as composed of a **Tyr rune**, [../04/0422.html../04/0422.html](#), lengthened upward, or by the rune [../04/0434.html../04/0434.html](#), turned upside down. In Germany and Austria it is often called the **Todesrune**, the **rune of death**, or an inverted **life rune**. According to some sources [../24/247.html../24/247.html](#) was conceived by placing the signs N and D (for Nuclear Disarmament) from the international marine flag signalling system on top of each other, and circumscribing the combination with a circle. Some state that [../24/247.html](#) [../24/247.html](#) was invented by Lord Bertrand Russell. S. T. Achen, however, claims that the symbol was designed by J. Holtom at the request of Russell. In any case it was initially used as a rallying sign at the 1958 demonstration against Aldermaston (a British research center for the development of nuclear weapons). The power of this symbol is emphasized by the fact that the South African government, during the 1970s, seriously considered forbidding it. They found it "anti-Christian" and "pro-Communist." Achen, the late Danish semiotician, wrote that [../24/247.html](#) [../24/247.html](#), ironically, was forbidden at times in some of the communist countries.

Center for Defense Information, an independent military research organization based in Washington, D.C.

Nuclear Weapons Database <http://www.cdi.org/issues/nukef&f/database/index.cfm>

Current Nuclear Arsenals

<http://www.cdi.org/issues/nukef&f/database/nukearsenals.cfm>

[Likely Nuclear Arsenals under the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty \(Moscow Treaty\)](http://www.cdi.org/issues/nukef&f/database/startab.html)

<http://www.cdi.org/issues/nukef&f/database/startab.html>

The Natural Resources Defense Council has historic data

<http://www.nrdc.org/nuclear/nudb/datainx.asp>

Federation of American Scientists -- arms control agreements

<http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/index.html>

Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty

<http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/sort/index.html>

Nuclear Age Peace Foundation [www.wagingpeace.org](http://www.wagingpeace.org)

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

**All treaties and agreements sorted by  
date of signature**

<http://www.nuclearfiles.org/redocuments/treaties-all.html>

<http://www.nuclearfiles.org/kinuclearweapons/acindex.html>

U.S. State Department

Treaties and Agreements

<http://www.state.gov/t/ac/trty/>

## Critique of SORT

[http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002\\_06/sortanaljune02.asp](http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002_06/sortanaljune02.asp)

<http://www.clw.org/control/sort/clwposition.html>

<http://www.ceip.org/files/nonprolif/templates/article.asp?NewsID=2932>

<http://www.nrdc.org/nuclear/atreaty02.asp>

<http://www.armscontrol.org/treaties/>

<http://www.ceip.org/files/nonprolif/resources/treaties.asp>

1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference

<http://www.un.org/Depts/dda/WMD/treaty/index.html>

UN Department on Disarmament Affairs

# **BASIC NOTES**

8 July 2002

---

## **Fact Sheet: Comparison of U.S.-Russia Nuclear Reduction Treaties**

*By Matt Rivers*

<http://www.basicint.org/pubs/Notes/2002factsheet.htm>

[http://www.thirdway.com/wv/article.asp?A\\_ID=93&Submit=Go](http://www.thirdway.com/wv/article.asp?A_ID=93&Submit=Go)

## **The news behind the nuclear news**

by J. Daryl Byler

The treaty does not require that a single nuclear weapon actually be dismantled. Some nuclear warheads would be removed from their launchers, but neither the launchers nor the warheads must be destroyed.

The process is akin to removing bullets from a loaded gun and storing them in the closet for future use. It should be called what it is – storing – not disarmament.

<http://www.rac.org/news/053102.html>

### **REFORM JEWISH MOVEMENT WELCOMES ARMS TREATY; CALLS FOR PERMANENT REDUCTIONS**

**Saperstein: *great accomplishments and missed opportunities***

<http://www.usccb.org/sdwp/international/tstjul23.htm>

photos of nuclear weapons

French M4-SLBM

<http://www.cdi.org/issues/nukef&f/database/frnukes.html#M-4%20SLBM>

Russian SS-N-23 Skiff

<http://www.cdi.org/issues/nukef&f/database/rusnukes.html#ssn23>

US MX Peacekeeper ICBM

<http://www.cdi.org/issues/nukef&f/database/usnukes.html#mx>

Trident I

<http://www.cdi.org/issues/nukef&f/database/usnukes.html#c4>

B-2 bomber

<http://www.cdi.org/issues/nukef&f/database/usnukes.html#b2>

nuclear explosion photos

<http://www.geocities.com/area51/vault/5862/nukepics.html>





## **Specifications for a "START IV" Treaty**

Reduction of U.S. and Russian strategic warheads to 200 to 400 on each side with a schedule for de-alerting, deactivation, and dismantlement as rapidly as practicable.

Provision for transparency and verification.

From 10 to 20 pages in length with cross-reference to other treaties if appropriate and appendices for detailed schedules if necessary.

## **Model Strategic Weapons Elimination Treaty (SWEET): A Proposal**

The Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT), also known as the Moscow Treaty of 2002, signifies that the United States and Russia are unwilling to find a way to mutually eliminate their nuclear arsenals, as required by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Although SORT provides for useful reductions in deployed strategic weapons, a sizable arsenal remains in active service and a large supply remains in reserve. Moreover, the treaty expires in 2012.

Yet it is in the self-interest of the United States and Russia to eliminate their strategic arsenals. As long as one side maintains a large arsenal deployed for quick launch on warning, the other side will do likewise. This in effect maintains the Cold War doctrine of mutual assured destruction (MAD) with the risk of accidental launch and quick retaliation. Both nations would be more secure if this threat was eliminated. But their governments are unwilling to act in this manner.

President Eisenhower once said, "I think that people, in the long run, want peace so much that one of these days governments had better get out of the way and let them have it." The time has come to apply this thinking to nuclear weapons. We the people of Earth are tired of the unwillingness of governments to eliminate nuclear weapons. Therefore, we should write a treaty that accomplish this task and insist that governments accept and implement it.

In 1997 citizens did indeed develop a Model Nuclear Weapons Convention that drew considerable praise. Governments, though, ignored it. That model remains as a useful document. However, at this moment it would be appropriate to take the first major step by developing a bilateral treaty between the United States and Russia to reduce their strategic arsenals to 200 to 400 warheads on each side. This is the approximate level of other nuclear weapon states, which would need to be brought into a broader treaty for the final elimination of nuclear weapons.

A Model Strategic Weapons Elimination Treaty (SWEET) should have these features:

- A schedule for de-alerting, deactivation, and dismantlement as rapidly as practicable. Neither side should be at a disadvantage at any stage of reductions.
- Provisions for transparency and verification.
- Of reasonable length, such as 10 to 20 pages with cross-reference to other treaties as appropriate and appendices for detailed schedules if necessary.
- Drafted through an open process that involves U.S. and Russian experts and input from persons living elsewhere. Citizen diplomacy could occur during the drafting process to keep U.S. and Russian government officials informed and gain their feedback.

Citizen education and coalition building would take place during the drafting process in order to set the stage for citizens to demand that the governments accept, ratify, and implement the model treaty. As a beginning, the Interfaith Committee for Nuclear Disarmament, a U.S. coalition, could ask some experts to draft a model treaty and then reach out to faith groups in other countries and to civil sector organizations in the U.S. and abroad to start building support for the model treaty.

Proposed by Howard W. Hallman, Chair, Methodists United for Peace with Justice  
September 19, 2002

## **Why Nuclear Weapons Should Be Eliminated**

- Voices of religion insist that the use and threatened use of nuclear weapons is morally wrong.
- Retired military leaders testify that nuclear weapons have no utility in war fighting.
- The huge arsenals possessed by the United States and Russia and the lesser arsenals of other possessors give legitimacy to nuclear weapons so that other states seek them.
- Terrorist groups could gain access to Improperly secured nuclear weapons and fissile material.
- Actual use of nuclear weapons would kill millions and have disastrous environmental effects.