

THE TRUE COST OF
TRIDENT

We are told we need Trident.
That it's a '*minimum deterrent*'.

We're told that Trident's safe, that it
presents only a minimal threat of radioactive
pollution to people or the environment.

We're told that at ten-and-a-half billion
pounds Trident's a CHEAP form of defence.

❓ **But what is the *TRUE cost* of Trident?**



The government's official cost of the Trident submarine-launched nuclear missile programme is just over ten-and-a-half billion pounds.

But this is an artificially low figure. It does not take into account billions of pounds' worth of costs on facilities which are essential to the programme.

Costs such as:

- £ *Development of the Trident submarine's nuclear reactor, construction of new Trident warhead production facilities at the Aldermaston Atomic Weapons Establishment, and building essential onshore facilities at the Trident submarine base on the Clyde. Together these come to over **two-and-a-half billion pounds.***
- £ *Trident's share of the running costs of Aldermaston Atomic Weapons Establishment where Trident warheads were developed and will be built and serviced - at least **six-and-a-half billion pounds.***
- £ *The cost of running and servicing the Trident fleet of submarines for the next 30 years - over **thirteen billion pounds.***
- £ *The cost of decommissioning the submarines with their highly radioactive reactors at the end of their life - a minimum of **seventy seven million pounds.** The cost of storage of the radioactive waste for thousands of years is unknown.*

Add on these hidden costs and the TRUE cost of Trident over its 30-year lifetime comes to over **thirty-three billion pounds.**

For the same amount of money that it will cost just to run the Trident nuclear submarine fleet, £380 million a year, you, could:

- +

Pay the annual running costs of 20 hospitals

or
- +

Pay the yearly salaries of 10,000 staff nurses and 3,000 consultants, AND be able to carry out 100,000 coronary graft bypass operations.

And you would still have £30,000,000 in change every year.

THE COST TO THE TAXPAYER



TOPHAM



The UK plans to replace these Polaris nuclear missile submarines with the far more powerful Trident.



TRIDENT REPRESENTS

A FOUR-FOLD INCREASE IN WARHEAD CAPACITY

AN EIGHT-FOLD INCREASE IN THE NUMBER OF TARGETS THAT CAN BE HIT

A NEAR-DOUBLING OF THE MISSILES' RANGE AND GREATLY INCREASED ACCURACY

A NEAR-QUADRUPLING OF THE NUCLEAR YIELD TO ELEVEN HIROSHIMAS PER WARHEAD

VSEL VANGUARD VSEL

If Trident were ever used it would not only annihilate cities and kill millions. The nuclear pollution caused by a Trident missile strike would trigger environmental disaster on a global scale.

But even if never fired, Trident poses a constant and serious threat to the environment. Just producing and deploying Trident is dangerous, creating nuclear pollution and waste.



Reactors at sea are at even greater risk of accident than those on land, because of the additional risk of collision or wreck to an ocean-going vessel and the much greater difficulty of dealing with a nuclear accident at sea. There are already an estimated eight nuclear reactors at the bottom of the sea as a result of accidents to US and Soviet submarines. A serious accident to a Trident reactor could cause terrible environmental damage, polluting the oceans for thousands of years to come.



Even if an accident doesn't happen, Trident's reactor - like all nuclear reactors - routinely pollutes the environment with radiation and radioactive waste, posing a non-stop hazard to crews, ports, the public, and marine life.



Trident's warheads require some of the most radioactive materials on earth, such as plutonium and uranium, to be produced, transported and processed into nuclear bomb components. The manufacture of nuclear warheads produces large quantities of highly toxic radioactive waste.



Once made, Trident warheads will be regularly transported back and forth across the country on public roads between their assembly plant at Burghfield in Berkshire, and the Clyde where Trident is to be based. A serious accident which damaged the warheads could release radioactive material, poisoning people and the environment. In the USA, the government were so concerned at the possibility of such an accident that they ordered a federal government enquiry and changes to warhead transport procedures.



*When the Trident submarines are decommissioned their reactor sections will be radioactive, and will remain so for thousands of years. There is no known safe method of disposing of these radioactive sections, and the government has put off a decision on what to do with those submarines already retired. **By building Trident we will be passing on to future generations a massive radioactive pollution problem.***

As a nuclear missile system deployed on nuclear-powered submarines, Trident can never be safe.

THE COST TO THE ENVIRONMENT



SYGMA



The explosion and fire at the Chernobyl reactor has poisoned the environment with radioactivity for years to come.



THE HIDDEN COST OF TRIDENT

Trident costs not included in the Government's official figures

Development of reactor propulsion plant	£535,000,000
Aldermaston works	£1,431,000,000
Clydeside construction works (Faslane & Coulport)	£401,000,000
Rosyth works	£285,000,000
Lifetime (30 years) running costs	£11,415,000,000
12 refits for the 4-boat fleet at £158,000,000 each	£1,896,000,000
Decommissioning costs	£77,000,000
Trident's share of Aldermaston running costs 1980-2030	£6,492,000,000
Improvement to submarine communications facilities and other unspecified costs	£35,000,000

TOTAL COSTS NOT INCLUDED IN OFFICIAL FIGURES **£22,567,000,000**

Added to the government's official cost of £10,518 million, this brings **THE TRUE COST OF THE TRIDENT PROGRAMME TO £33,085 MILLION.**

The UK is building the new Trident system at a time when the Soviet threat no longer exists - when Russia and the United States no longer have thousands of missiles targeted on each others' cities, and are racing to dismantle their nuclear arsenals.

But while the two nuclear superpowers disarm, Britain is increasing its nuclear firepower. Trident has twice the range, far greater accuracy, can hit many more targets and has far greater explosive yield than the Polaris system it replaces. This determination to continue fighting the Cold War after everyone else thinks it's over can only be at a serious cost to hopes of freeing the world from the threat of nuclear war.

The vast majority of countries in the world have no nuclear weapons, and many of them have signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) - pledging not to buy or build nuclear weapons. Britain has also signed the NPT, and is committed by Article 6 of the treaty to enter into negotiations on reducing its nuclear arsenal. Instead, by continuing with the Trident programme, the UK is **expanding** its nuclear arsenal.

What kind of example are we setting with Trident? We cannot argue that **we** need more nuclear weapons for **our** defence and then expect other countries not to want them too.

Nuclear weapons like Trident do not protect a country against attack - the Falklands War and the Gulf War proved that.

It is becoming increasingly clear that Trident is now a useless relic of the Cold War, a dangerous encouragement to other countries to obtain their own nuclear weapons, and an expensive embarrassment to Britain.

THE COST TO WORLD PEACE



SYGMA



The city of Hiroshima was annihilated in 1945 by a 14 kilotonne nuclear bomb. Just a single Trident warhead has eleven times more destructive power.



POLARIS AND TRIDENT COMPARED

POLARIS/CHEVALINE

No of submarines	4
Range	2,500 miles
Missiles per submarine	up to 16
Warheads per missile	2 (not independently targeted)
Warhead yield	40 kilotonnes
Total warheads	up to 128
Total destructive capacity	up to 5,120 kilotonnes (over 360 Hiroshimas)

TRIDENT II D5

No of submarines	4
Range	4,500 miles
Missiles per submarine	up to 16
Warheads per missile	up to 8 (independently targeted)
Warhead yield	150 kilotonnes
Total warheads	up to 512
Total destructive capacity	up to 76,800 kilotonnes (over 5,486 Hiroshimas)

Weigh up the *true cost* of Trident

- to the taxpayer, to the environment,
and to international stability.

NOW ASK YOURSELF



CAN WE AFFORD TO PAY IT?

