

Andre David Broche

R → date reg
→ changed or not

Prolif – myth created early 1990s – Iraq –
Use of nw against CB – disproportionate escalation – threat not credible
Bunker busters – surface, high yield – lots of fallout – crosses boundaries incl allies;
> US low-yield, more accurate – but won't get round nuclear taboo.
No credible place for nw from military viewpoint
Pre Gulf War 1 – Powell – nuclear / conv comparison

Br – uncertainty – not trip wire – more so today – vague ref to Russia and ambiguous about Counter Prolif

Dependence

MDA and Pol Sales – “Supreme nat int at stake”
Missile + - software sub & shore
Warhead – off shelf NG, Tritium reserv, AF&F
Options – not NATO or independent – but bilateral (US global strike)

show
new part
by
other way -

Legal

ICJ 8 July 1996 (10 yrs ago) – “the threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of international law applicable in armed conflict”

FCO - “Our work over the year has focused on implementing existing multilateral treaties, which are the cornerstone of international counter-proliferation efforts”

NPT Art VI “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 control.”

Nuclear hypocrisy: do as I say not as I do - Iran and Britain
Br nw Reported in Mid East & Asia (Pak/Ind/Chi)

The options

Pol / Tri – only one real option – or get out of business
Sea cruise – 1991 Rus/US agreement; US will probl stop,
Bombs – vulnerable; No suitable US missile for Ac; B2 ??
Son of Trident – US LE – upgrade missile guidance – new Br sub ?
- warhead – change all components
RRW – Br replacement pit
Nevada test end Feb – prob help RRW

W

Timescale

Dec 2003 – will need to decide on replacement for Tri in life of next Parl; ie between 2005 & 2010; Repeated more recently;
Clarification – Jn Reid – “some decisions” will have to be made in current parliament; but not imminent;
Late 2005 – Jn Reid – there are c6 officials working on this; but have not yet been asked to draw up option papers;
Feb 2006 – Tony Blair – a decision will be made on the **timeline** before the end of 2006. *Subs not safe*
Why do they need to decide? – ~~Subs have planned~~ *Subs not safe* life of 25 years each – first would be scrapped in 2019, last in 2024; MoD submission to Def Cmte – this could be extended by around 5 years – but with increasing cost, and risk (that couldn't keep one on patrol); Prob similar planned life of warheads. With Pol/Tri decision made in 1980 – first sub operational 14 years later in 1994; So need to make decision by 2010, poss by 2008.

Why should CND focus on? – shouldn't we concentrate on getting rid of Tri tomorrow?

(1) If a decision was made not to replace Trident – then it would become increasingly difficult to sustain the expenditure on it – It is likely that Trident could be scrapped 2 / 5 years after decision – not just in 13 - 18 years time.

(2) This is an opportunity which only comes round every 30 years. The last time a similar decision was made was in the late 1970s – the Callaghan government reviewed the options in secret – there was a growing protest against Trident in the early 1980s – but this time we need to be actively campaigning before the decision is made.

Why have the bomb

MAD

→ Unrestricted bomb!
bum
– Br part of – Moscow criterion – V bombers – Pol – Chev – Tri;
How many Russian cities to destroy – 5/ 10 / 20 Lord Home – not what would deter Russia – but what will the American's think.
20 years ago correspondence between Gorbachev / Reagan – lead to summit in Iceland, Reykjavik, 1986 – “in 10 years time we could meet up again and be destroying the last missile” – officials – Sherbednaze – if don't succeed history will not forgive.
Berlin wall came down – collapse of Warsaw Pact – Soviet withdrawals – collapse of Soviet Union
1991 – some substantial reductions in nuclear weapons – nuclear artillery, nuclear weapons on surface ships and cruise, bombs reduced (Lee Butler) – but kept many – Br Trident build continued – Tri entered service after its justification had gone – illustrates the momentum of the nuclear juggernaut – cf B61s – US mil reports – not rational – inspection of units – pol or mil – let commanders know which – if pol don't need to train –

Campaigning

Decision making process – Attlee made decision to build bomb with only kitchen cabinet – full cabinet not informed – £1 billion Chevaline upgrade –

On 26th April 1974 Henry Kissinger discussed plans with the British Cabinet Secretary, Sir John Hunt. They agreed that the upgrade to Polaris would be kept secret. Sir John said "We will say nothing. If there are leaks or gossip that Ministers have to answer, we will say something banal about taking all steps necessary to maintain the credibility of an independent nuclear deterrent". There is a need to challenge the banal language which today conceals both the modernisation of Trident and the irrationality of British nuclear policy.

In Reid – said won't repeat secrecy of the past – will have to be open – politically couldn't get away with. Tony Blair – haven't decided whether there should be a vote in parliament.

Ministers are already under pressure from a series of questions in parliament on how the decision will be made.

We are encouraging constituents to write to their MPs to sign 2 EDMs

176 – 1113 and 1197 .. 106 and 107

If it this point we can influence how the decision is made – we are increasing the chance of altering the decision.

Costs £1 billion per year – running costs – equivalent to around 40,000 firemen/midwives (more nurses, fewer teachers) – not just capital costs of new system – if build new system would plan to keep for 30 years – £30 billion – myth that running costs are less than capital costs.

Raise Awareness Street poll – most people don't know what Trident is – fewer that there are plans to replace it – among those that do, most are opposed.

Events Scotland's for Peace, Oran Mor, Aldermaston inspection, Scotland's long walk for Peace.

Polls

ALMOST 80% of Scots oppose government plans to purchase a nuclear alternative to Trident, according to a System Three Poll in April 2005. Voters of all political persuasions were against a new nuclear missile system. Scots were asked: "Would you support or oppose the government buying a new nuclear missile system to replace Trident?" While 13% said they would support plans for the British government to spend billions on an updated nuclear deterrent, 78% said they would oppose the move. Of the 1000 voters polled 69% of traditional Conservative voters said they would be against the move, as were 79% of Labour voters and 82% of those who would normally vote Liberal Democrat; 87% of Scottish Socialist Party voters opposed it while the biggest opposition came from SNP voters, who registered 89%.

Greenpeace poll Oct 05: general 46% against replacement, 44% in favour – when £25 billion cost mentioned – 54% opposed, 33% in favour.

lab robin stuc -