

Peace Now!



Volume 2 : Issue 2 , 2004

The Bulletin of the Coalition for Nuclear Disarmament & Peace

EDITORIAL

Fifty nine years back, by the close of the Second World War, the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were made to suffer the indescribable trauma of being incinerated by atomic bombs dropped from the sky by the US air force. Never before in the history of humanity so many died with so much pain. And those who survived their fate was perhaps even worse. The conscience of the humanity was stirred as never before. 'Hiroshima and Nagasaki', since those fateful days of 6th and 9th August 1945, became a byword for a supreme tragedy and a monumental crime. Under the impact of the nuclear blasts a strong wave of public opinion swept across the length and breadth of the globe. A global anti-nuke peace movement took shape with Japan as one of the major nerve centres. Close to six decades have elapsed. But the goal of the global peace movement remains to be realised. Rather the nuclear arsenals have over the years grown far deadlier, and more numerous. Today all the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council are legitimate(!) Nuclear Weapons States (NWSs). Possession of nuclear weapons, instead of attaching a deep moral stigma, carries the glow of (super) power!

Just over six years back, reversing the feeble but real trend towards global de-nuclearisation triggered off by the end of the Cold War, two Asian countries, India and Pakistan, gate crashed into the exclusive club of nuclear powers. And after an initial period of shock and condemnation, the neo-nukes have now come to be accepted as de facto, if not de jure, members of the nuclear club. Then in the West Asia Israel is a sort of undeclared nuclear weapons state, and yet enjoying all the patronage of the US, the hyper power ostensibly engaged in curtailing nuclear 'proliferation' by all means and on that plea currently training all its guns on Iran and North Korea.

Bombing of Hiroshima and

Nagasaki came at the fag end of the Second World War, when the outcome of the War had already become abundantly clear and the Axis powers were just on the verge of collapse. Though the surprise bombing of the Pearl Harbour naval base of the US by a suicide squad of the Japanese air force was used as the alibi, the real reason – it is widely acknowledged, was to stun the potential challengers - the USSR in particular, into submission to ensure global domination of the US in the post-War era. The nuclear weapons then have always been considered as the currency of power and domination, despite contrary claims of its proponents. And it is the drive for power and domination which still propels the

Admiral Ramdas receives Ramon Magsaysay Award

The grant of the Ramon Magsaysay award to India's Admiral Laxminarayan Ramdas and Pakistan's LA. Rehman is an honour for South Asia's growing peace movement and a tribute to civil society initiatives for India-Pakistan reconciliation. We in the Coalition for Nuclear Disarmament and Peace (CNDP) feel particularly pleased at the award: Admiral Ramdas has been an active member of CNDP's National Coordination Committee right since its inception in November 2000.

Ramdas is the only former defense services chief in South Asia to have categorically opposed nuclear weapons and the dubious doctrine of nuclear deterrence. More than 60 former generals and admirals the world over have done so. Conscientious citizens should pay heed to these voices of sanity as they struggle against militarism, and for peace and justice. While welcome in itself, the India-Pakistan peace process cannot succeed without reducing and eventually eliminating the nuclear danger in our volatile region.

■ **Special articles:**
by S. P. Udayakumar, J. Sri Raman,
M. B. Naqvi, Lalit Surjan, Qamar Agha,
C. Rammanohar Reddy

■ **CNDP in Actions**

■ **Clippings from International Press:**
Tearing Down The Wall: Call for a
Global Campaign

■ **Anti War Assembly**

process of nuclear weaponisation.

Today the US, more so under the neo-con regime headed by George Bush – unabashedly committed to the goal of unfettered global domination, constitutes the most major impediment in the path of global disarmament and de-nuclearisation. It has on the one hand embarked upon the slippery and dangerous path of unilaterally abrogating the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty to engage full steam in the Nuclear Missile Defence (NMD) and Theatre Missile Defence (TMD) programmes and also developing tactical nuclear weapons meant for actual use in the battle field. While the NMD and TMD are evidently going to upset the existing power balance and thereby trigger off a new phase of arms race, the so-called ‘tactical’ weapons are only going to radically bring down the threshold for use of nuclear weapons. Its brutal war on Iraq, justified in terms of the doctrine of ‘pre-emption’, similarly threatens to seriously unsettle all established international norms which have been put in place over the years to avoid and control international wars and

conflicts. The other NWSs, by refusing to fall out of the line, also pose a major problem.

The West Asia and South Asia are the two regions which have emerged as the major sources of concern. A just and fair solution of the Palestine issue was always the key to the prospects of peace in West Asia. Now destabilisation of Iraq has further added to the explosive potential of the region.

Similarly only a constructive dialogue between India and Pakistan, with honest intentions to settle all the contentious issues between the two belligerent neighbours and also fulfilling the legitimate and democratic aspirations of all sections of the Kashmiri people remains the only conceivable way of mitigating the very palpable nuclear danger in the region, which has quite often in the recent past been labelled as the ‘most dangerous nuclear flashpoint’.

The phenomena of uncontrolled nuclear proliferation via international blackmarkets to various sundry state (and maybe also non-state) players, as had recently come to be dramatically revealed through the Dr. A Q Khan, the so-called Father of the

Pakistani Bomb, episode have added new and urgent dimensions to the threat of nuclear holocaust.

In this issue, apart from global peace and de-nuclearisation in general, we have dealt extensively with the ongoing Indo-Pak peace process with special reference to its nuclear dimensions in the context of the recent regime change in India, and the new hopes and apprehensions that it has brought forth. Also under focus is Iraq, as it ought to be, given its centrality in impacting the unfolding American neo-con project for establishing unchallengeable dominance over the globe by controlling its vital resources of industrial fuel, viz. hydrocarbon, through naked display and use of unparallel military prowess. But what makes Iraq even more important from our point of view is the fact that it has - rather paradoxically, emerged, a la Vietnam, as the greatest causative factor for building and sustaining an international peace movement, unprecedented in recent times in terms of its reach and appeal, engaged in fighting back America’s imperial lust and arrogance.

Nuclear Power in India: A Comprehensive Update

INDIA’S DEPARTMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY: Fifty Years of Profligacy

S. P. Udayakumar

Odd as it may sound, the Department of Atomic Energy (DAE), one of the most powerful and pampered departments of the government of India, is not celebrating its fiftieth anniversary with much fanfare. Although the department has emerged as a darling child of the Indian elites and one of the “fathers” of the frightful atomic bomb has been crowned as the President of India, the mood in DAE is rather subdued.

In fact, in an interview to the

Frontline magazine (February 14 - 27, 2004), Mr. Anil Kakodkar, Chairman of Atomic Energy Commission and Secretary of DAE, said: “We are not in the celebrations mode.” When the persistent interviewer pointed out that fifty years is an important milestone, Kakodkar reiterated: “We are in the introspection mode right now.” He pointed out two elements of this introspection: “looking at how to prepare ourselves for the future” and “trying to capture some important

aspects of the history of the atomic energy programme in our country.” Translation: “We need to accomplish something concrete, and we haven’t been doing a good job.”

Although the tentative ‘Indian Atomic Energy Commission’ was set up in August 1948 in the new and fledgling Department of Scientific Research, it was only on August 3, 1954 the fully-fledged Department of Atomic Energy (DAE) was created under the

direct control of the Prime Minister through a Presidential Order. The Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) itself was established in the Department of Atomic Energy by a Government Resolution of March 1, 1958. Just three months after the DAE was established, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru unequivocally declared in a conference on 'Development of Nuclear Power for Peaceful Purposes': "We want to utilise atomic energy for generating electricity because electricity is most essential for the development of the nation."

On the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the DAE, it is pertinent to reflect on what the Indian nukedom has accomplished in the past fifty years. Take a good look at the statistics. In 1950 India was producing a meager 1,800 MW power but in 1998-99 we generated about 90,000 MW. Almost all of this was thermal and hydropower and the share of nuclear power was an insignificant 1,840 MW — a ridiculously low 2 per cent of the total energy production. As of today, the Indian nukedom claims, their energy output has increased to 2,770 MW. It is hardly 3 per cent even if we keep the total energy output at the stagnant level of 90,000 MW.

Although the DAE failed to achieve their target of producing 10,000 MW power by the year 2000, they are so full of pipe dreams and keep promising big things. The fact of the matter is most of the 14 units (two at Tarapur in western Maharashtra state, four at Rawatbhatta in western Rajasthan state, two at Kalpakkam in Tamil Nadu, two at Narora in northern Uttar Pradesh, two at Kakrapar in western Gujarat and two at Kaiga in southern Karnataka) are beset with technical problems. Dr B K Subbarao, a retired naval captain who is familiar with the nuclear department, asserts that "the country's six nuclear power plants with 14 units are operating at low capacities."

A simple comparison of

nuclear power projects with hydro and thermal power projects would show that nuclear energy is way too expensive and ineffective. For the first time, on December 1, 1999 the Nuclear Power Corporation of India Ltd. (NPCIL) presented a maiden dividend cheque of Rs 504.4 million to the prime minister. It is important to note that NPCIL itself was incorporated in 1987. You don't have to be a genius to imagine the amount of money, time, energy, human and other resources that should have gone into these nuclear institutions and their activities since 1948. Put all these facts and figures together and you get a classic picture of inefficiency and incompetence.

Nuclear power is not only costly but also deadly. Serious accidents are happening at the Indian nuclear power plants. For instance, in March 1999, there was a leak of heavy water in the second unit of MAPS reactor at Kalpakkam, near Madras. The Atomic Energy Regulatory Board (AERB), another wing of Indian nukedom, dismissed the incident by saying that "the release to the environment is maintained well within the limits specified by the AERB." But M V Ramana, an Indian scientist, estimated that the radioactivity released to the environment was "several times the permitted 300 curies per day per reactor and perhaps even exceeding the discharge limit of 10 times the daily quota." He further asserted that the dose to workers was likely to have been much greater than the AERB claims.

Indian government admitted in December 1999 for the first time that heavy water with radioactive tritium above limits set by the AERB got released into the Rana Pratap Sagar lake from the Rajasthan Atomic Power Station in May 1998. In December 1999 New Delhi also acknowledged that 21 issues relating to nuclear safety raised by the AERB as far back as 1996 had not yet been addressed. In December 1991 Bhabha Atomic Research Centre reactor workers discovered a big

radioactive leak from poorly maintained pipelines in the vicinity of the Cirus and Dhruva reactors causing severe soil contamination.

Last year, six employees of the Kalpakkam Reprocessing Plant (KARP) were exposed to radiation exceeding the annual dosage limit. There was a "power rise" in one of the Kakrapara units because "the operator failed in not tripping the reactor in time." Three employees at the Waste Immobilization Plant (WIP) at Tarapur received high doses of radiation from a tiny bottle containing highly radioactive waste. We know only what they say. Protected by secrecy and opacity, the Indian nukedom has been hiding things rather efficiently.

Considering our national track record on safety awareness and emergency preparedness, many Indians do fear that major accidents could take place in Indian nuclear power plants. A cursory look at the Bhopal tragedy, frequent train accidents, airplane accidents, assassination of so many top-level leaders, and other such fiascos show that we, as a nation, are not good at averting disasters or at being prepared for unexpected emergency situations.

It is very strange that in a democratic country like ours, certain departments, projects and scientific advisors are treated as "sacred cows" with no need for any transparency and accountability. They function like extra-constitutional authorities and not even elected public representatives and the media have any knowledge or information about these entities, their budget or their activities.

The specifics of nuclear weapons and energy programs that have such an enormous bearing on the lives and futures of Indian citizens of India are kept away from the "ordinary citizens" under the pretext of national security. In fact, the Atomic Energy Act of 1962 (clause 18) states that we cannot ask, or gather or disclose

any information about present, past or future or planned atomic plants.

Instead of facilitating closer scrutiny and vigilance, the Indian nukedom and officialdom are heading in the opposite direction. In June 2000, the Indian government took away the authority of the Atomic Energy Regulatory Board to oversee the safety of a large number of critical nuclear installations meant for the weapons program in the Bhabha Atomic Research Centre (BARC). An internal safety committee became responsible for ensuring the safety of the public and the workers from dangers that could emanate from these facilities. This move seriously undermined the AERB's responsibility for unbiased and independent safety regulations.

Many local people and anti-nuclear activists in Kanyakumari, Tirunelveli and Thoothukudi districts of Tamil Nadu have been demanding the Department of Atomic Energy (DAE) and the Government of India to respect their Right to Information and to release the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), the Site Evaluation Study, and the Safety Analysis Report that are claimed to have been done way back in 1988 for the Koodankulam Nuclear Power Project that may go critical in 2007. Even though these studies are now outdated and many changes have been brought about in the project, local people do have the right to know what the government and the Indian nukedom really argue.

The DAE has also sidestepped the Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board (TNPCB) in getting proper permission for setting up the Koodankulam project. The mandatory Public Hearing has never been conducted to this day. Although the original plan is to have two 1000 MW reactors, the DAE authorities keep adding the number of reactors in Koodankulam unilaterally as if they were running a state within the Indian state. Keeping the civil and political societies in the dark about their

actual plans in Koodankulam, the DAE is acting with no transparency and accountability whatsoever.

So much money has already been wasted on nuclear power projects and the current cash crunch is mainly due to nuclear power being very expensive, inefficient and capital intensive. So the top officials of Indian nukedom have expressed interest in inviting private investments. To reach their target of 20,000 MW power by the year 2020, they say they need a whopping amount of Rs 800 billion. What all this means is that while private companies make money with no responsibilities, Indian taxpayers and the "ordinary citizens" will bear the cost of dealing with the nuclear waste and other dangerous consequences.

A highly populated developing country like India does have an increasing need for energy. But that energy has to be economical, sustainable and environment-friendly precisely for the same reasons of over - and dense - population. Even a small mishap can hurt, harm or kill a huge number of people. The "use and discard" strategy adopted in nuclear power projects is not viable for obvious reasons of limited land availability and the serious impacts of nuclear waste on the present and future generations' health and safety. Moreover, we cannot afford to spend all our scarce resources on energy production alone because we have other pressing needs such as health, education, housing, transportation and so forth.

It is foolhardy for India to embark upon power production through nuclear plants when technologically advanced countries such as Sweden and Germany have decided to phase out the nuclear power option. The nuclear energy companies in the United States are closing down old units and not starting new ones. The nuclear power projects do not help the social and economic development of India but only add to the power, prominence and prestige of upper class financiers

and power barons. These "temples of science and technology" (in Russian President Putin's view) provide the middle class scientists and engineers stable job, steady income, and comfortable living. But what do 400 million poor people of India get out of these nuclear power projects is a big question mark.

To face the increasing needs of energy, the answer is not embarking upon costly and highly dangerous nuclear power generation, but preventing distribution loss, theft and streamlining inefficient administration. There are also many viable non-conventional energy sources such as solar, wind and bio-mass. We already have solar fridges, solar radios, and even solar hearing aids. We have solar cookers in various shapes and sizes. Now the world's first solar-powered crematorium is built in Gujarat and it will save about 600 pounds of firewood for each body cremated.

India's potential realization in the wind power sector is said to be in the range of 20,000 MW to 45,000 MW. As of today, the total installed capacity of windmills in Tamil Nadu alone is more than 1,350 MW and an additional 450 MW will be added in this financial year. The Ministry of Non-conventional Energy Sources (MNES) has prepared a master plan for 80 potential sites in 10 States on the revised criterion based on mean annual wind power density (MAWPD). The Koodankulam (Tamil Nadu) area that has hundreds of windmills now is one of them. There have been several teething troubles such as inadequate wind data, weak grids and outages and incompatibility of the largely imported infrastructure. If only we put enough emphasis and resources on renewable sources of energy, we could have sustainable living in India without dangerous radiation and deadly diseases.

Indo-Pak Peace

THE MYTH OF 'PEACE MOVES': A VIEWPOINT

J. Sri Raman

We have had a whole series of India-Pakistan "peace moves", including talks, since the beginning of 2004. What is the total upshot of it all thus far? And what should be the Indian peace movement's attitude towards such "moves"?

The second question is of special importance, as the movement has yet to take a stand on these "moves" as a whole.

Following are just a few thoughts on the questions.

There was never any doubt about the motive force behind the "moves". It was the anxiety of the George Bush Administration of the USA to keep under control the contradiction and conflict in the South Asian segment of the "coalition against global terror", while the conquest of Iraq was contemplated and carried out.

The first promise of such "moves" came in a public speech in Srinagar in April 2003 by former Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee. It came as a surprise, after the exchange of a series of belligerent statements between New Delhi and Islamabad.

There were many indications of Washington's pressure on both to pipe down and parley. Even if the pressure could be indirect. Two examples should do. One was a set of US signals to Islamabad, after allegations of Pakistan's nuclear-technology-sharing with North Korea. Signals, to quote peace activist A. H. Nayyar, that "Pakistan has to fall in line or it could be the target in future". As for India, around the same time, US Secretary of State Colim Powell thought it fit to warn the country's ruler against equating Pakistan with Iraq.

The talk of "peace moves", in that context, was really addressed to Washington and meant to mollify it.

The question that arises here

is: what real progress could be expected from "peace moves" of such prompting? The US pressure could, of course, be seen as a "window of opportunity". So, however, was the emergence of the unipolar world, seen positively as the end of the Cold War.

Was not the perception of an opportunity in both cases a case of wishful optimism, to say the least?

The Vajpayee government made a virtue of necessity. The former Prime Minister was acclaimed by his party as the champion of peace. The politician, who had talked of "aar paar ki ladai" (a fight to the finish) with Pakistan, was projected as a second Mahatma. The BJP's election propaganda also put much stress upon this, even if its campaigners included Narendra Modi of the "mia Musharraf" notoriety and others of his ilk.

"Peace moves" of this kind could not carry much promise. This is a point that the peace movement could and should have made then but, whatever the reasons, failed to make. The people needed to be put on guard against the campaign to promote illusions of an India-Pakistan peace round the corner. If Pokharan II and Chaghai had indeed led to such happy ending, brought about by their authors, it was time for the peace movement to pack up.

True, the "moves" led to long-overdue restoration of certain people-to-people contacts snapped by India for no valid reason at all. True, India Eleven toured Pakistan and won both the cricket tournaments. These, however, could not be said to have brought peace closer to the two countries and their people.

Peace remained a distant prospect as long as the BJP remained a member of the

'parivar', to which anti-Pakistan animosity was a patriotic principle. As long as it remained allied to the Shiv Sena and others, to whom all peace – internal and external – was anathema. As long, above all, as both New Delhi and Islamabad remained committed to nuclear militarism.

The post-election "peace moves" are only an extension of the pre-election series. The present government has inherited the process. True, again, the people have put the current rulers in power in the hope that they won't try to make India "shine" with the splendour of a satellite. The people's vote, however, is only a wish. It requires a struggle to make it a reality.

The two rounds of India-Pakistan talks, held so far, do not raise hopes of an imminent peace. The talks at the level of additional secretaries achieved no more than a resolve to set up a "hotline": between directors-general of military operations (DGMJOs) and Foreign Secretaries. And no media hype can make this anything like the miracle we were told, way back in January, to wait for.

Raja Menon, no peace activist, has quoted a Hindi proverb to say that the talks have produced "a mouse after digging a mountain". An apt summing up, considering the contemptuous dismissal by both the sides of the peace movement's demands for non-deployment of nuclear-capable missiles and declarations of unconditional moratoriums by both on nuclear-weapon tests. The talks between the Foreign Secretaries have failed to produce even "a mouse". Both sides seem to have devoted their skills and energies to find a mutually acceptable way of mentioning the Simla Agreement in their joint statement.

The post-talks statements by

both the governments testify to the non-progress achieved. Defence Minister Pranab Mukherjee has reiterated his government's commitment to India's nuclear programme. President Pervez Musharraf says "only a madman" can expect Pakistan under him to roll back its nuclear-weapon programme. Pakistan has denied the existence of "terror camps" on its soil. Mukherjee, again, says that

the "terrorist infrastructure" is "intact" on the other side of the Line of Control.

The politics of "fundamentalism" and fascism continue to thrive in Pakistan and India. The lessons of the recent "encounter killings" in Ahmedabad should not be lost upon the Indian peace movement. The lawless killings are being justified on the ground that the young victims were

allegedly "terrorists" linked to the Kashmiri extremists and Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI).

The job is cut out for the peace movement : carry on a people's campaign for India-Pakistan peace, without being carried away by the official "peace moves" at all.

Let's Think Coolly and Talk

MB Naqvi

The schedule of the long-stalled Composite Dialogue between India and Pakistan has been agreed. Beginning July 28; it will reach the Foreign Ministers level meeting on August 25 next. This preliminary process is to start the substantive political-level negotiations from August 25 onward where actual give and take can take place. Definitive results will start coming later.

It is notable that officials' talks are being held amidst almost a euphoria. There is, for no solid reason, hope and expectation in the air, more in Pakistan but also some in India. Not too long ago, the relations between the two countries were at an all time low and a war seemed imminent during the long military confrontation of 2002. There was intense propaganda of hate in both countries. And yet the red hot tensions quickly gave way, after India's PM was mysteriously persuaded to switch from a jingoistic stance to extending a hand of friendship to Pakistan last year. Clouds of war soon began to lift and people's latent desire for peace and friendship in both countries asserted itself. What helped was, of course, the US 'facilitation', Track II diplomacy by establishment's trusted emissaries and work of innumerable Track III groups: like Pakistan India People's Forum for Peace and Democracy, many similar bodies and Imtiaz Alam's SAFMA. People's true desires

were articulated by this third track of non-officials.

The common people on both sides are aware of what they have lost in the huge extravagance of vital resources in futile confrontations and mutual boycott by Pakistan and India. This is the true bedrock on which a real people-to-people reconciliation from grassroots up can be built if properly led - such as has happened between the German and French peoples in post-war period. On this foundation imposing edifices of not only Pak-India friendship, free trade, economic cooperation and politically harmonious policies of peace can be raised but also real regional integration can be anchored in.

Let no one forget that Pakistan-India relationship can shift from love to hatred quickly. This is what enabled BJP government to stir up much hatred, at least among the upper and middle classes, against Pakistan during and after Kargil affair. Pakistan could also reply in kind. Mark the swiftness with which dominant sentiment changed and all classes, at least in Pakistan, quickly awakened to the need for peace and friendship. After all South Asia used to be Historical India, where Hindus and Muslims lived cheek by jowl in harmony for centuries. Thanks to the rise of acrimonious communalisms under the British, it is now necessary to remind that Hindus and Muslims

of India jointly created the magnificent Indo-Persian civilisation; its sources, bases and imperatives are still alive - hence a basis of close friendship exists.

Let no one forget that huge stumbling blocks to a friendship policy have been erected since 1940s. They flourish on the latent negative legacies that are also there. These are many. (a) There is the complex and difficult problem of Kashmir; two rival nation states of unequal potential are vying for the same real estate on which so many and so diverse people live. That it is a complicated problem is well known. It is bound to be a long haul and no quick fix seems possible or will be realistic. Both sides need patience and goodwill.

(b) Two competing nationalisms have arisen and are based on the growth of communalisms during the Raj. These contradict and violate the legacy of over seven or eight centuries of intimate Hindu-Muslim coexistence: the Indo-Pakistan Civilisation. The political dynamic of these nationalisms requires contempt and hatred for the "other". This fomented feeling is generated and strengthened by packaging it in patriotism. Allied to it is - and which has become the outstanding feature of these rival nationalisms - militarism and jingoism. Moreover, all large militaries create powerful vested interests. In America, they call it Industrial Military Complex. Both Pakistan

and India have their own bureaucratic versions of this Complex. Its leading lights can only enrich themselves and acquire importance, when relations between the rival powers are worsening. They are also able to spend on propaganda handsomely and many media persons are always obliging.

(c) Another result of these nationalisms is two fully-fledged and rival Nuclear Deterrents in the subcontinent. One thing that nuclear weapons do, with absolute certainty, is to destroy basic trust among nuclear rivals. The unfortunate fact is that so long as Pakistani nukes - the Bomb, delivery vehicles and accessories - are poised, who in India will sleep easy that they will never be used (i) as a result of deliberate intent, (ii) accident, (iii) miscalculation or (iv) a non-state revolutionary group getting access to the Red Button. The same applies to Indian nukes: none in Pakistan can ignore the possibility of the use of Indian nukes in many of the same eventualities.

This mistrust is fundamental; it is an inescapable product of two rival nuclear deterrents. In the presence of these WMDs, long-term prospects of Pakistan-India friendship will retain a roller-coaster quality. These can prevent the bright possibilities from being realised. There is no solution to the problem they pose. South Asia can never settle down to peaceful pursuits, so long as WMDs are not consigned to the dustbin of history through more enlightened and more focused agreements of far reaching mutual dependence.

True, the two Foreign Secretaries are discussing the nuclear subject. The official publicists on both sides have given a great build up to the proposals that the Foreign Secretaries have exchanged in their last meeting in New Delhi. India has proposed several nuclear Confidence Building Measures. Pakistan has also proposed an elaborate set of the same genre, called Nuclear Restraint Regime. One suspects the origin of both sets of CBMs is common. In fact, it may be a

notional and 'in-principle' agreement between Pakistan and India that the US has helped shape through the Track II diplomacy - that itself came into being as a result of US initiative. The agreement is that both should remain nuclear powers and seeking recognition as nuclear powers. The US only desires that India and Pakistan should strengthen their Command and Control Systems, so that the possibility of accidents, unintended, miscalculated or unauthorised launch should be prevented by timely mutual consultation.

The US diplomacy has evolved voluminous literature on how two military enemies can arrive at detente to prevent accidents, unauthorised launch and how to keep the WMDs safe from terrorists. They acquired this wisdom from generation-long negotiations with the Soviets. They have shared it with both India and Pakistan, and both seem to have lapped it up because both love to have the tacit American approval of their nuclear status. Thus, by seeming to be a selfless do gooder, the US has the gratitude of both countries' establishments. Cost of it all is that the US is now the arbiter of Indo-Pakistan affairs and the two new nuclear powers are eating out of American hands. But the biggest negative point is that the two countries are now more likely to negotiate CBMs and ignore the real problems posed by WMDs from a long term viewpoint.

Are CBMs, no matter how perfect, a solution to the problems posed by NWMDs? One should not be misunderstood: one is not against CBMs as such; one supports all real CBMs. But when we have eliminated the chances of accidents in storage, transportation, servicing and have a perfect C3 for the WMDs, including preventing their unauthorised use and present rulers' finger staying firmly over the final button, what then? Can such CBMs prevent the election of a party like Shiv Sena or VHP in India? What if any elected government in New Delhi, driven

by militant nationalism and manipulated by vested interests, threatens a nuclear strike on Pakistan territory? Which CBM will prevent that? The same applies to Pakistan, where another general or a Jihadi group can seize power. What if he threatens to nuke India unless it relents on Kashmir quickly? Pakistani rulers are known to have taken many imprudent decisions.

Is it wise for Pakistan and India to preserve NWMDs and remain on high alert for all times to come? One will go so far as to say that Pakistan cannot go on living on edge, constantly worrying about the balance of power, balance of terror and the constant effort to upgrade its deterrents.

That involves huge opportunity losses and a financial burden that will snuff out real development and can lead to the Soviets'-like implosion. Such a possibility needs to be obviated. Pakistanis need higher living standards and more freedoms. That requires working for a Nuclear Free South Asia, as a first step. We should aim at that.

CBMs, while being unexceptionable, are no solution. The only solution is to do away with the WMDs altogether. But one encounter with any informed Indian will show that the constituency for doing away with the nukes and reverting to a Non-Nuclear South Asia is tiny. India is likely to go on becoming ever more powerful, with more of all kinds of weapons. Pakistan is claimed to be irrelevant to it. Policy makers in Islamabad, however, know no better than to go on scrapping the bottom of the barrel to keep up with the Indian Joneses. Would that do the job?

Unfortunately, it will neither enable Pakistan to keep up a given power ratio with India nor will it ever be able to attend to the problems facing the common Pakistanis, with all the attendant political, economic and social risks. The situation poses a big challenge. (Reproduced from The News International [Pakistan], July 21, 2004)

Indo-Pak Defence Spending

C. Rammanohar Reddy

India and Pakistan are two of the largest spenders on defence in the world. In spite of the ongoing attempts to give a new thrust to normalisation of bilateral relations, the two countries continue with their major drive at militarisation. The current phase of military expansion is, in part, linked to the decision by both countries to become nuclear powers. It is also a continuation of the trend established in the 1990s when India began a modernisation programme and Pakistan, in response, hoped to keep pace with its neighbour. Both programmes have imposed huge financial and opportunity costs on the two economies. With India and Pakistan deciding to continue on the nuclear path, the cost of nuclear weaponisation is only going to increase in the years ahead. In short, militarisation in the two South Asian neighbours, which has always imposed costs on their development efforts, will continue to do so in the future.

Both countries figure among the biggest spenders in the world. According to the most recent data compiled by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), India's military defence expenditure, when measured on market exchange rate, amounted to US\$. 12.9 billion in 2002, making it the country with the 11th highest military expenditure in the world. Pakistan does not figure in SIPRI's list of the 15 largest spenders in the world. However, when national military expenditure is compared on a purchasing power parity (PPP) basis, the picture is quite different. According to SIPRI, India with an expenditure of US\$. 66.2 billion in 2002 ranks third in the world. Only the U.S. and China made a larger outlay than India on defence last year. Pakistan with a military outlay in 2002 of US\$. 14.2 billion (PPP terms) ranked 15th in

the world.

An attempt at assessing the impact of military expenditure on the economies of India and Pakistan has to begin with an estimation of the true size of the burden of defence. Unfortunately, in India and Pakistan, the budgetary figures on defence do not give a complete picture of total outlays. The data for India is far more transparent than for Pakistan (where there is only a single line figure on defence in the official documents) but the problem in both countries is that budgetary figures under-estimate the true burden of militarisation.

SIPRI estimates cover a reasonably broad definition of what constitutes defence expenditure, but in as much as these estimates too rely on published documents, the assumption must be that the SIPRI data is also not complete. It appears that in larger countries, defence expenditure as a proportion of GDP is generally lower than in the smaller countries. Thus, China, India, the U.S. and even Russia have lower defence-GDP levels than Pakistan, Israel, Turkey and Saudi Arabia, although it is difficult to assert that the first group of countries shows a significantly lower level of militarisation than the second group. One can speculate that there is always a 'minimum' level of military infrastructure that all countries have to establish, which is reflected in smaller countries showing a higher defence-GDP ratio. However, even if this is true, one cannot deny that a high degree of militarisation is responsible for the astronomically high defence-GDP estimates for Israel and Saudi Arabia.

Defence Spending during the 1990s

The defence spending-GDP ratio is the standard yardstick of

measurement of the burden of defence. As will be argued later, this is not the best indicator of spending. But what of spending in absolute terms? SIPRI estimates of military outlays in the two South Asian countries during the 1990s provide a basis for comparison. This is presented below:

Military Expenditure (in \$ million, at 2000 prices)

<i>Year</i>	<i>India</i>	<i>Pakistan</i>
1990	8051	2636
1991	7532	2823
1992	7209	2997
1993	8137	2993
1994	8109	2917
1995	8340	2965
1996	8565	2961
1997	9307	2837
1998	9387	2833
1999	10482	2858
2000	10900	2867
2001	11837	3071
2002	12882	3176

Source: SIPRI estimates (2003)

The facts show that in India expenditure in real terms initially declined during the 1990s only to pick up gradually from the mid-1990s. From the late 1990s onwards there has been a sharp acceleration. Indeed, between 1998 and 2002 – an interval of just four years — there was a 37 percent increase in outlays. This is a huge increase in real terms. The rise would have been even larger but for the fact that in recent years capital spending has turned out to be less than budgeted for.

The trend is different for Pakistan. After an initial spurt, military outlays were more or less stagnant in the first half of the 1990s, before falling slightly and showing a moderate increase in the initial years of the first decade of the 21st century. Although Pakistan shows a smaller increase than India, the country remains – as argued below – more militarised than India.

The Indian Case

An attempt has been made here to estimate the full extent of defence expenditure for India in recent years. Where data presented earlier have been either of official nature or of SIPRI estimates, the exercise here takes a larger sweep of all defence, para-military and related expenditure – an aspect which is of particular importance to the nuclearisation of the two countries.

Indian official estimates of defence spending, as reported in the budget, cover current and capital expenditure in the three forces and also research and development. They do not cover (i) pensions, (ii) para-military expenditure (iii) defence-related atomic energy outlays and (iv) defence-related space outlays. SIPRI estimates include the first and second items of outlays.

In this paper, a broad coverage of defence expenditure in India has been covered. This coverage is necessarily approximate and is based on a number of assumptions. The source, however, remains the budget documents of the Government of India. Para-military expenditure is as reported in the Home Ministry outlays. The biggest assumption is regarding defence-related space and atomic energy expenditure. It is assumed that 25 percent of all outlays on space and atomic energy (other than for nuclear power generation) have a defence orientation. This is a reasonable assumption to make, given that much of India's ongoing nuclear programme will be based on work done at the nuclear and space research establishments.

These conclusions are given below :

'Official' versus 'Alternate' Estimates for India (Rs crores, at current prices)

Year	Official	Alternate
1995-96	26879	33940
1996-97	29498	37336
1997-98	36099	46120

1998-99	41200	54255
1999-2000	48504	66232
2000-01	54461	72308
2001-02	57000	75170
2002-03	56000	73777
2003-04	65000	83955

Source: Computed from Government of India Budget documents

In 2003-04 (budget estimates), the budgeted outlay, according to the alternative estimate of defence expenditure is 29 percent more than the official figure. The gap between the official and alternate estimate widens in the late 1990s, exactly when Indian defence expenditure begins to accelerate. The higher outlays, according to the alternative estimate, take the defence spending-GDP ratio to much higher levels. Thus, while the official figures suggest a defence spending-GDP level of 2.5 percent in 2001-02, the alternate estimate leads to a ratio of as much as 3.3 percent. Clearly, when all aspects of defence spending are taken into account, outlays are much higher than the figures that form the basis for the official data.

It is more than a reasonable speculation that a similar exercise conducted for Pakistan will show a similar (perhaps even larger) gap between the official and true levels of defence spending. Unfortunately, the same exercise cannot be done for Pakistan because of the much greater opaqueness of official statistics in Pakistan.

Real Burden

Military spending dwarfs government spending on the two main social sectors of education and health. This is reflected in the following World Bank data for 1999 – the latest year for which information is available. The comparable data are for public spending as a proportion of GDP, not of total government expenditure, but the data still tell the same story.

Defence vs. Education and Health (% of GDP, 1999)

Country Public Spending on Health Public Spending on

Education Defence Spending

India	0.91	4.1	2.3
Pakistan	0.9	1.8	4.6

Source: World Development Indicators Database (World Bank, 2003)

South Asia has some of the worst indicators in health and education, yet the governments of India and Pakistan clearly prefer to spend more on defence.

It is clear that India and Pakistan are showing higher levels of defence spending than other low-income countries or the world as a whole. Where the size of the military population is considered, the Indian figure is lower than the global average while for Pakistan it is larger. In arms imports, Pakistan spends relatively much more than what the low-income countries do. On the whole, the message that comes through from these figures is that India and Pakistan give considerably more importance to defence than other countries that are at roughly the same level of development.

Guns versus Butter?

The most powerful critique of an expansionary military spending that has been made in recent times is the one offered in 2002 by the economists, Jean Dreze and Amartya Sen. The critique is of India's policy since the late 1990s and covers India's nuclear weapons policy as well. But the argument is equally valid for Pakistan. The argument made by the two economists is that there are many 'social costs of militarism' of the kind pursued by India. One, rising military expenditure imposes substantial opportunity costs on government priorities like health care and primary education, even if every rupee saved in defence does not lead to a corresponding hike in social sector spending. Two, nuclear weaponisation (the financial costs are discussed below) leads to increased insecurity in South Asia. Three, nuclear weaponisation will lead to

an arms escalation in South Asia, which will end up in further diversion of scarce resources to the defence sector. Four, there is not merely a diversion

of economic resources when countries like India and Pakistan embark on an arms race. There are also the demands made on 'the time and energy' of political leaders, government officials and the public at large. Fifth, military expansionism leads to a diversion of scientific and technological resources to the defence sector. The research and development expenditure in defence, space and nuclear field in India constitutes over 60 percent of total government research outlay in the country.

Dynamics of Nuclear Weapons

It is often argued that a nuclear weapons programme for India will not be expensive. The reasoning is that India already has a nuclear infrastructure in place and that the additional expenditure required will not be much. Another reason given is that India will not duplicate the gigantic nuclear weapon models of the U.S. and the former Soviet Union and instead develop a small nuclear arsenal. This, however, is not correct reasoning.

First, as events since 1998 have shown, nuclear arms have not reduced spending on conventional arms in India. If anything, the increased insecurity that nuclear weapons have brought to the region has led to higher conventional arms spending. Second, while in theory one can make the case for a small nuclear weapons arsenal, in practice the demands for an expanding arsenal will keep growing. This has already been taking place with signs of an inter-service rivalry in India, major import/joint development programmes for supporting infrastructure (command and control) and expanded/new

programmes like the anti-missile defence systems etc. Much of this is reflected in the numerous deals and proposals India has been exploring with Israel, Russia and even the U.S. All this suggests that the elements of a new arms race are in the making in the subcontinent.

A very conservative estimate of the cost of an Indian nuclear weapons programme suggests that at a minimum this would cost Rs. 800 billion over a decade at 1998-99 prices, or Rs. 700-800 billion a year. This is equivalent to an incremental cost of 0.5 percent of India's GDP every year. The dollar costs over a decade on an Indian nuclear weaponisation programme will be around US\$. 16-19 billion (at the average 1998-99 market exchange rates) or US\$. 81-93 billion (at the 1999 purchasing power parity, PPP, exchange rate). The larger component in these costs would be the outlays on delivery systems (missiles and nuclear submarines) and on a command and control system.

An Indian nuclear weaponisation programme that would cost 0.5 percent of GDP a year is equivalent to the annual cost of introducing universal elementary education in India. This 'high' cost was for years cited as one of the reasons for not universalising elementary education in India. The question then is of choosing between sending every Indian child to school and acquiring nuclear weapons – both of which are going to make similar financial demands on the Government of India. Although India's Parliament in 2001 enacted an amendment to the Constitution guaranteeing elementary education to every Indian child, the initial financial allocations suggest that the government is giving a greater importance to nuclear weapons than to universal elementary education.

In recent years, India has entered into a number of arms import agreements and is planning to purchase more from the U.S.,

Russia, Israel, the U.K. and France. These deals are not for nuclear weapons per se, but they are for a number of weapons and defence systems that will become an integral part of a command and control infrastructure that India is building for its nuclear arsenal. They include anti-missile systems, intelligence radar, delivery aircraft and leasing of nuclear submarines. In addition there has been a new thrust to domestic research and development directed towards missiles. If even some of these costs are allocated to the Indian nuclear weapons programme – as they must be – then the annual cost of the Indian weapons programme will end up as much more than 0.5 percent of GDP.

In all this, Pakistan has not been found wanting. Pakistan too has announced it is developing its command and control infrastructure, it has tested new missile systems and announced its plans to enter into arms deals so as to neutralise the Indian arms purchase spree. The net result is that Pakistan has embarked on an expensive nuclear weapons programme which will only add to its already high defence expenditure.

Conclusion

The most significant development in recent years, which is going to have a profoundly negative impact on military spending, leading to an arms race and increased insecurity, is the decision of India and then Pakistan to go nuclear. This has given a new dimension to militarisation in the region. The nuclear arms race, which has just begun, will add to the burden of costs. In addition, it will contribute significantly to insecurity in the region.

All this has had and will have major economic and social costs. The major economic costs are that with defence making the first charge (after interest costs) on both governments, there will be limited resources available to

meet the many economic and social challenges in the two countries.

In sum, the current levels of military spending in India and Pakistan – slated to grow with nuclearisation – are going to continue to hold back development in one of the poorest regions in the world. Militarisation is one

important factor, not the only one but an important reason nevertheless, for the low levels of human development in both countries. This is not going to change dramatically as long as India and Pakistan persist with their present policy of building a nuclear arsenal and giving considerable importance to

expanding their military infrastructure.

(This is an abridged version of the original article published in the South Asian Journal, Issue 3 <http://www.southasianmedia.net/index_forum.cfm?country=main&id=99>)

ANTI-WAR ASSEMBLY

As you know the situation in Iraq, which today is the crucible of world politics, is dire. The US and its allies are carrying out the most brutal forms of repression including massive aerial bombing of ordinary Iraqis because the resistance to occupation is growing and spreading. The Iraqi people today need the widest possible solidarity from progressive people throughout the world. Indeed, such are the stakes that the US is playing for, that it knows a defeat in Iraq and a military-political withdrawal from the country will signal a decisive defeat of its empire-building project in the region. The heroic struggle of the Palestinian people will then receive a tremendous boost just as Israel and a host of US-dependent Arab regimes will be shaken to their roots. All the more reason, therefore, why the US's imperial designs must be opposed and thwarted.

Furthermore, the Indian government and its dominant elites are being called upon by Washington to lend their practical and moral-political support to the US efforts to maintain control over Iraq. Even after the installation of the United Progressive Alliance (UPA) government in New Delhi there will be pressure on it to recognise the puppet "interim regime" that will be formed in Iraq after June 30th and to which sovereignty is supposedly being handed over. The US and UK are aiming to secure a UN endorsement of this farce which, if successful, will in turn make it easier for the Indian and other governments to follow suit. These efforts at disguising the reality of American domination and ambitions must also be opposed. Indeed, it should be clear that the US military-political presence in South Asia (which is growing steadily) will itself create obstacles to promoting genuine peace between India and Pakistan as the US seeks to manipulate the elites and governments of both countries. It has already been doing this with some considerable success.

The need for a national level 'Anti-War Assembly' to bring about a massive show of resistance to US designs in Iraq and West Asia and also in South Asia has never been greater. Anti-War Assemblies have already been set up in other countries and regions and have been a vital part of the collective effort at globalising resistance to US imperial behaviour in Iraq and elsewhere. Under the umbrella of the **Citizens Against War and Occupation**, representatives of over 30 organisations met in New Delhi on June 5 and 6 in the first National Consultation meeting with the aim of setting up later this year a major public event – the Anti-War Assembly. This would be a crucial part of the broader process of institutionalizing, invigorating and strengthening the Indian wing of what is now a **globally** developing and expanding Anti-War and Anti-Imperialist platform and movement. It is only through such global forms of resistance that our enemies, themselves operating on the global level, can be defeated. This was the lesson of the great international Anti-Vietnam War Movement of the past. The same lesson holds true today!

CITIZENS AGAINST WAR AND OCCUPATION

The dates and venue for the Assembly will be fixed and informed as soon as possible.

For further information

contact Qamar Agha,

A-124/6 Katwaria Sarai, New Delhi 110016;

Email: peaceact@vsnl.com Phone: 91-11- 26968121, 26858940.

On Iraq

Sovereign Iraq!

Lalit Surjan

On 28th June 2004, two days before the scheduled date, the US handed over sovereignty to Iraq. This should have been cheered as great news by Iraq, by West Asia, by Islamic world, and above all by pro-democracy and peace loving people of the world. But this did not happen. The US administrator Paul Bremmer took recourse to formally transfer power to the Iraqi Prime Minister, a nominee of the US, in a hush-hush manner (it will not be correct to describe it a ceremony) and sneaked out from the country. While this was going on, President Bush was attending a NATO meeting in Istanbul. His National Security Advisor Condelezza Rice passed on a little piece of paper telling him 'Iraq is sovereign'. The US President pompously scribed on the same slip 'Let freedom reign.'

President Bush's presence in Turkey while sovereignty was being handed over to Iraq was not a coincidence. Neither, perhaps the advancing of date, nor scribing of those three words by him. What I suspect is that his presence in the neighbourhood at that precise moment was meant to collect instant gratitude and greetings of West Asia. And the pronouncement of freedom on a slip of paper was also aimed at preparing a document for the history.

The US is gearing up to go to the presidential poll in four months from now with President Bush seeking re-election. Naturally, he would make all possible efforts to refurbish his image. He had done the same two years ago with an eye on the mid-term elections. In a planned manner scare of Iraq was created, language of war was used in a very careful way, Saddam Hussein was depicted as the demon and Bush the saviour, and elections were won.

The 2002 mid-term elections brought another victory for Bush. He had won presidential election in a dubious manner, getting lead from Florida- the state ruled by his brother,

and got it sanctified by a controversial decision of the US Supreme Court. Yet, in the public eye, he was a man occupying the high office by deceit. He used this opportunity to wash his soiled image. Today, when once again the elections are near and his career is at stake, he has started talking about peace and freedom, knowing that war on Iraq has made him an object of hate and ridicule all over the world.

But empty words would not suffice. Latest opinion polls show that his personal rating has touched an all time low. His allies in Europe are also facing public wreath in their respective countries. No exercise in damage control seems to be working. The initiative to hand over sovereignty to Iraq is yet another exercise in that direction. The truth is that the US is in full control of the occupied country, and it has no intention of withdrawing for a long time to come. The world understands it, and that is the reason that no greetings have been offered to the president.

It may be recalled that Prime Minister Alawi, who took charge from the US administrator, is a former intelligence officer of the infamous CIA. Each and every member of the so-called governing council of Iraq has also been handpicked by the US. It is not for nothing that a few weeks ago the chairman of the governing council was killed. Most of the members of the council have returned home after living abroad for long years. They all are anti-Saddam, but they have not come to fight a principled battle. Paul Bremmer has gone back, but more than 1,60,00 US troops are going to stay there for an indefinite period. In other words, full control of Iraq continues to lie with the US. In the meanwhile, NATO has indicated readiness to train the Iraqi Army. Thus, in one way or another, American intervention will be there. It seems that Iraq is destined to go

the Afghanistan way.

Iraq has second largest reserves of oil after Saudi Arabia. It is now in the American hands. The US has already launched a clandestine campaign against the unpopular Saudi government and the royal family. It will do its best to ensure that in the eventuality of a revolt, yet another crony of the US replaces the royal family and that democracy does not take roots on the Saudi soil. In Iraq, the US has not only gained control of the oilfields, but in the name of re-construction all jobs and contracts have been allocated to American companies. Most of these firms are in the hands of friends and families of Bush and Cheney company.

The days to come promise to bring more misery and tragedy to Iraq. Who will stop the US soldiers when they will torture Iraqi people? Will they obey the command of the so-called governing council? Who will stop the bloody battles being fought in the streets every day? How can one hope for everlasting peace when the divide between Sunni, Shiite and Kurds has become more pronounced? In spite of all management in the American hands, oil production has gone down sharply, power supply has become almost non-existent and access to potable water has become more difficult, who will correct this situation? Saddam Hussein is slated to undergo trial in Baghdad, how the Iraqi people are going to react to it? Amongst all this, living conditions of ordinary people has gone from worse to worst. Who is responsible for it?

If the US government and President Bush were honest in their intentions, they would have taken steps to recall all US troops from Iraq, and handed over the country to the United Nations to facilitate the peace process. I don't see any other alternative for bringing back peace to the tormented country. We need to build up world opinion for this. The

peace groups in the US need moral support from rest of the world at this juncture. The US-led war on Iraq is the first big tragedy of the twenty-first century. A new society can't be built without countering it.

Paying the Price: The Mounting Costs of the Iraq War

A Study by the Institute for Policy Studies and Foreign Policy In Focus

Key Findings

(I. Costs to the United States / II. Costs to Iraq / III. Costs to the World)

I. Costs to the United States

A. Human Costs

U.S. Military Deaths:

Between the start of war on March 19, 2003 and June 16, 2004, 952 coalition forces were killed, including 836 U.S. military. Of the total, 693 were killed after President Bush declared the end of combat operations on May 1, 2003. Over 5,134 U.S. troops have been wounded since the war began, including 4,593 since May 1, 2003.

Contractor Deaths:

Estimates range from 50 to 90 civilian contractors, missionaries, and civilian worker deaths. Of these, 36 were identified as Americans.

Journalist Deaths: Thirty international media workers have been killed in Iraq, including 21 since President Bush declared the end of combat operations. Eight of the dead worked for U.S. companies.

B. Security Costs

Terrorist Recruitment and Action:

According to the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies, al Qaeda's membership is now at 18,000, with 1,000 active in Iraq. A former CIA analyst and State Department official has documented 390 deaths and 1,892 injuries due to terrorist attacks in 2003. In addition, there were 98 suicide attacks around the world in 2003, more than any year in contemporary history.

Low U.S. Credibility: Polls reveal that the war has damaged the U.S. government's standing and credibility in the world. Surveys in

eight European and Arab countries demonstrated broad public agreement that the war has hurt, rather than helped, the war on terrorism. At home, 54 percent of Americans polled by the Annenberg Election Survey felt that the "the situation in Iraq was not worth going to war over."

Military Mistakes: A number of former military officials have criticized the war, including retired Marine General Anthony Zinni, former commander of the U.S. Central Command, who has charged that by manufacturing a false rationale for war, abandoning traditional allies, propping up and trusting Iraqi exiles, and failing to plan for post-war Iraq, the Bush Administration made the United States less secure.

Low Troop Morale and Lack of Equipment: A March 2004 army survey found 52 percent of soldiers reporting low morale, and three-fourths reporting they were poorly led by their officers. Lack of equipment has been an ongoing problem. The Army did not fully equip soldiers with bullet-proof vests until June 2004, forcing many families to purchase them out of their own pockets.

C. Economic Costs

The Bill So Far: Congress has already approved of \$126.1 billion for Iraq and an additional \$25 billion is heading towards Congressional approval, for a total of \$151.1 billion through this year. Congressional leaders have promised an additional supplemental appropriation after the election.

Long-term Impact on U.S. Economy:

Economist Doug Henwood has estimated that the war bill will add up to an average of at least \$3,415 for every U.S. household. Another economist, James Galbraith of the University of Texas, predicts that while war spending may boost the economy initially, over the long term it is likely to bring a decade of economic troubles, including an expanded trade deficit and high inflation.

Oil Prices: Gas prices topped \$2 a gallon in May 2004, a development that most analysts

attribute at least in part to the deteriorating situation in Iraq. According to a mid-May CBS survey, 85 percent of Americans said they had been affected measurably by higher gas prices. According to one estimate, if crude oil prices stay around \$40 a barrel for a year, U.S. gross domestic product will decline by more than \$50 billion.

D. Social Costs

U.S. Budget and Social Programs:

The Bush administration's combination of massive spending on the war and tax cuts for the wealthy means less money for social spending. The \$151.1 billion expenditure for the war through this year could have paid for: close to 23 million housing vouchers; health care for over 27 million uninsured Americans; salaries for nearly 3 million elementary school teachers; 678,200 new fire engines; over 20 million Head Start slots for children; or health care coverage for 82 million children. Instead, the administration's FY 2005 budget request proposes deep cuts in critical domestic programs and virtually freezes funding for domestic discretionary programs other than homeland security. Federal spending cuts will deepen the budget crises for local and state governments, which are expected to suffer a \$6 billion shortfall in 2005.

II. Costs to Iraq

A. Human Costs

Iraqi Deaths and Injuries:

As of June 16, 2004, between 9,436 and 11,317 Iraqi civilians have been killed as a result of the U.S. invasion and ensuing occupation, while an estimated 40,000 Iraqis have been injured. During "major combat" operations, between 4,895 and 6,370 Iraqi soldiers and insurgents were killed.

Effects of Depleted Uranium:

The health impacts of the use of depleted uranium weaponry in Iraq are yet to be known. The Pentagon estimates that U.S. and British forces used 1,100 to 2,200 tons of weaponry made from the toxic and radioactive metal during the March 2003 bombing campaign.

Many scientists blame the far smaller amount of DU weapons used in the Persian Gulf War for illnesses among U.S. soldiers, as well as a sevenfold increase in child birth defects in Basra in Southern Iraq.

B. Security Costs

Rise in Crime: Murder, rape, and kidnapping have skyrocketed since March 2003, forcing Iraqi children to stay home from school and women to stay off the streets at night. Violent deaths rose from an average of 14 per month in 2002 to 357 per month in 2003.

Psychological Impact: Living under occupation without the most basic security has devastated the Iraqi population. A poll by the U.S. Coalition Provisional Authority in May 2004 found that 80 percent of Iraqis say they have “no confidence” in either the U.S. civilian authorities or in the coalition forces, and 55 percent would feel safer if U.S. and other foreign troops left the country immediately.

C. The Economic Costs

Unemployment: Iraqi joblessness doubled from 30 percent before the war to 60 percent in the summer of 2003. While the Bush administration now claims that unemployment has dropped, only 1 percent of Iraq’s workforce of 7 million is involved in reconstruction projects.

Corporate War Profiteering: Most of Iraq’s reconstruction has been contracted out to U.S. companies, rather than experienced Iraqi firms. Top contractor Halliburton is being investigated for charging \$160 million for meals that were never served to troops and \$61 million in cost overruns on fuel deliveries. Halliburton employees also took \$6 million in kickbacks from subcontractors, while other employees have reported extensive waste, including the abandonment of \$85,000 trucks because they had flat tires.

Iraq’s Oil Economy: Anti-occupation violence has prevented Iraq from capitalizing on its oil assets. There have been an estimated 130 attacks on Iraq’s oil infrastructure.

In 2003, Iraq’s oil production dropped to 1.33 million barrels per day, down from 2.04 million in 2002.

Health Infrastructure: After more than a decade of crippling sanctions, Iraq’s health facilities were further damaged during the war and post-invasion looting. Iraq’s hospitals continue to suffer from lack of supplies and an overwhelming number of patients.

Education: UNICEF estimates that more than 200 schools were destroyed in the conflict and thousands more were looted in the chaos following the fall of Saddam Hussein. Largely because of security concerns, school attendance in April 2004 was well below pre-war levels.

Environment: The U.S.-led attack damaged water and sewage systems and the country’s fragile desert ecosystem. It also resulted in oil well fires that spewed smoke across the country and left unexposed ordnance that continues to endanger the Iraqi people and environment. Mines and unexploded ordnance cause an estimated 20 casualties per month.

Human Rights Costs: Even with Saddam Hussein overthrown, Iraqis continue to face human rights violations from occupying forces. In addition to the widely publicized humiliation and abuse of prisoners, the U.S. military is investigating the deaths of 34 detainees as a result of interrogation techniques.

Sovereignty Costs: Despite the proclaimed “transfer of sovereignty” to Iraq, the country will continue to be occupied by U.S. and coalition troops and have severely limited political and economic independence. The interim government will not have the authority to reverse the nearly 100 orders by CPA head Paul Bremer that, among other things, allow for the privatization of Iraq’s state-owned enterprises and prohibit preferences for domestic firms in reconstruction.

III. Costs to the World

Human Costs: While Americans make up the vast majority of military and contractor personnel in Iraq, other U.S.-allied

“coalition” troops have suffered 116 war casualties in Iraq. In addition, the focus on Iraq has diverted international resources and attention away from humanitarian crises such as in Sudan.

International Law: The unilateral U.S. decision to go to war in Iraq violated the United Nations Charter, setting a dangerous precedent for other countries to seize any opportunity to respond militarily to claimed threats, whether real or contrived, that must be “pre-empted.” The U.S. military has also violated the Geneva Convention, making it more likely that in the future, other nations will ignore these protections in their treatment of civilian populations and detainees.

The United Nations: At every turn, the Bush administration has attacked the legitimacy and credibility of the UN, undermining the institution’s capacity to act in the future as the centerpiece of global disarmament and conflict resolution. The recent efforts of the Bush administration to gain UN acceptance of an Iraqi government that was not elected but rather installed by occupying forces undermines the entire notion of national sovereignty as the basis for the UN Charter.

Coalitions: Faced with opposition in the UN Security Council, the U.S. government attempted to create the illusion of multilateral support for the war by pressuring other governments to join a so-called “Coalition of the Willing.” This not only circumvented UN authority, but also undermined democracy in many coalition countries, where public opposition to the war was as high as 90 percent.

Global Economy: The \$151.1 billion spent by the U.S. government on the war could have cut world hunger in half and covered HIV/AIDS medicine, childhood immunization and clean water and sanitation needs of the developing world for more than two years. As a factor in the oil price hike, the war has created concerns of a return to the “stagflation” of the 1970s. Already, the world’s major airlines are expecting an increase in costs

of \$1 billion or more per month.

Global Security: The U.S.-led war and occupation have galvanized international terrorist organizations, placing people not only in Iraq but around the world at greater risk of attack. The State Department's annual report on international terrorism reported that in 2003 there was the highest level of terror-related incidents deemed "significant" than at any time since

the U.S. began issuing these figures.

Global Environment: U.S.-fired depleted uranium weapons have contributed to pollution of Iraq's land and water, with inevitable spillover effects in other countries. The heavily polluted Tigris River, for example, flows through Iraq, Iran and Kuwait.

Human Rights: The Justice Department memo assuring the White House that torture was legal

stands in stark violation of the International Convention Against Torture (of which the United States is a signatory). This, combined with the widely publicized mistreatment of Iraqi prisoners by U.S. intelligence officials, gave new license for torture and mistreatment by governments around the world.

(Excerpted from <<http://www.ips-dc.org/iraq/costsofwar/>>)

National scene in Iraq

Qamar Agha

Over a month old transfer of power in Iraq to a nominated interim government and a unanimous United Nations Security Council resolution giving international legitimacy to the new caretaker government may have been considered a major diplomatic victory for President George Bush. But it has clearly failed to deliver the goods and has resulted in generating wide discontentment among the people in Iraq. Apparently, there is no change in the situation. Violence is continuing unabated. Islamic militants and the Saddam loyalists continue to target US-led multinational troops and their Iraqi "collaborators". Even foreign citizens are not spared. People belonging to different nationalities, including India, Russia and France, who are not proponents of US policy in Iraq have been taken hostages. Islamic militants are leaving no stone unturned to create chaos and anarchy in order to make it impossible for the interim government to function. On the other hand, the liberal Islamic organizations belonging to Shias as well as Sunnis are calling upon the militants to put an end to acts of violence and instead prepare themselves for the January 2005 elections.

The new government that has come into being has inherited enormous problems. The major challenge before it remains how to gain the confidence of the people and secure peace in a war-

ravaged country where 7-8 million light weapons are in private hands. Electricity, clean water, life saving drugs and other essential commodities are in short supply. Earlier, the occupation authorities have not paid enough attention to restore these essential supplies to the pre-war level. Unemployment is officially estimated at 30 per cent. However, the Americans have succeeded in bringing oil production back to pre-war level, which is roughly 2.5 barrels per day. The government hopes to add another 500,000 barrels per day by the end of the year. The other tasks before the government is to reconstruct the institutions of the state that were dismantled by the occupation authorities and to conduct elections and install a duly elected representative government in January 2005. It would not be easy for the interim government to achieve these objectives.

The US-backed Iraqi government does not enjoy much support among the people. Most of the leaders of the interim government were earlier living in exile and they hardly have any contacts with the local people. It is generally believed that the US-appointed government would not have much autonomy in policy making because of the presence of 160,000 coalition troops in the country. Iraq is dependent on foreign troops for security. The Americans had dismantled its army soon after the occupation. As it is,

large numbers of Iraqis do not have much faith in the American administration due to its involvement in two wars and for having imposed a decade long regime of economic sanctions in the 1990s that caused enormous suffering to the people. Moreover, its support to belligerent Israeli policies in the occupied territories and the Arab governments' inability to deal with the Jewish state are major sources of worry for the Arabs. In Iraq, nationalism is deep rooted and the people have a long history of resisting Anglo-American moves in the region. In the 1950s the Iraqis had overthrown the British-backed monarchy, had withdrawn from the Baghdad Pact, and had later nationalized their oil industry. It would not be surprising if the Americans persuade the new government to revive the old policies in Iraq, encourage Iraq and other pro-Western nations of the region to recognize Israel and form a security alliance under the hegemony of the US, UK and Israel to deal with the problem of Islamic militancy. The US believes that Islamic militancy is as big a problem today as was international communism during the cold war era. It, therefore, senses the need to form a greater alliance to deal the problem. The US troops would remain in the country until terrorism is eliminated and democracy established in the region. Troops are deployed as part of the on going "war on

terror”.

The major problem in Iraq today is how to maintain unity among the religious and ethnic communities. The sudden removal of Saddam Hussein from power by a foreign country has created a power vacuum. The Shias, the Sunnis and the Kurds are competing to gain power. It is bringing about a division among the various ethnic and religious communities who were earlier living in perfect harmony for centuries. In Iraq, Shia Arabs comprise more than 60 per cent of the population, whereas the Sunni Arabs and the Kurds are almost in equal numbers together comprising approximately 35 per cent of the population. The rest are Christians, Turks and other ethnic communities. The other problem is the rise of Islamic militancy due to the presence of foreign troops in the country. They see the presence of foreign troops as an “occupation”, not “liberation”, and consider it a threat not only to their sovereignty but also to their religion and culture. Therefore, the Islamic militant organizations believe it is their religious duty to wage *jiha*d against the presence of foreign troops and the US backed government in Baghdad.

In the new Iraqi set-up, the major communities are sharing power on equal terms. As a result, no religious or ethnic group is happy with the American formula. However, the Sunni extremist groups have outrightly rejected it. In the new constitution, sovereignty is vested in the Presidency, not the Parliament. The Prime Minister can rule by decree, provided that all three members of the presidency — a Sunni, a Shia and a Kurd — give their assent. The National Council, primarily a consultative body comprising 100 members who are yet to be chosen, will need a two-thirds majority to overturn such decrees. The council would have the powers to question legislations, make new appointments and approve the country’s 2005 budget. Liberal commentators

believe that this would be a “good cover for the interim government”. The Shias are blaming the Bush Administration for introducing a system that is meant to marginalize them. They are accusing the Bush administration of using the same old method of “divide and rule”, using one community against the other, and carving out a role for themselves as arbitrator.

The Shias are demanding that the Bush administration should establish a democratic government answerable to the people. Their preference is for parliamentary democracy. They believe that a genuinely democratic set-up would help establish peace and stability prevent the army from returning to power and reduce the country’s dependence on foreign powers. It would also help them secure a greater share in power. They want to live in peace and harmony with other communities. They are the ones who suffered the most during Saddam’s rule. The Shias also want to develop closer ties with other Arab as well as Persian neighbours and to play a constructive role in bringing the two closer for ensuring regional peace and harmony. The Arab-Persian rivalry is often exploited by the big powers. The Shias are in a unique position both because of their country’s geographical location as well as their good relations with both Sunni Arabs and Shia Iranians. Nationalism is deep rooted among the Shias in Iraq. They had not responded to Iran’s Shia spiritual leader Imam Khomeini’s call to revolt against the Ba’athist regime when it was at war with Iran.

The ethnic Kurd minority in the north is demanding maximum autonomy within the present set-up. Kurdish leaders have refused the government’s demand that their Peshmerga militiamen be absorbed into the re-formed national army. The interim constitution gives the Kurds a veto over laws drafted by the central government. Leaders of Iraq’s Shia Arab majority insist that this must only be a temporary provision. But the Kurds say they will reject any new constitution

that omits their veto power. However, their ultimate aim is to bring unity among the various regions over which they are spread and to establish a separate homeland for themselves. After the disintegration of the Turkish Empire in the First World War, the historic Kurdistan was divided among Iraq, Turkey, Syria and Iran. Since then both the Arabs as well as the Turks have suppressed them.

The larger majority among the Sunni Arabs has no problem in sharing power with the Shias in Iraq. But the conservative Sunni Arab leaders are demanding that the Americans should hand over power only to them as they had been ruling the country and the region for centuries. They put forward the following argument: “Sunnis make up 85 percent of the population of the Arab world. How could it be democratic for a national Shia majority to rule an Arab country?” They are not willing to accept “Iraq to be ruled by the Shiite.”

The traditional Wahabite organisations are willing to cooperate with the US but they are demanding a greater share in power for the Sunni Arabs. The al-Qaeda backed Islamic militants are totally opposed to both US as well as Shia rule in Iraq. They are also opposed to democracy, which they consider a western concept that has no place in Islam. Both the Wahabite as well as the Jihadies have declared that they would prefer to see “Iraq in chaos rather than ruled by Shia Arabs.” They do not even consider the Shias as Muslim. Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, a Jordanian allied to al-Qaeda, called upon the Sunni Arabs to “start a war with Iraq’s Shias.” The conservatives Arab rulers in the neighbouring countries have not come out with their particular preferences regarding the Iraqi regime. They believe it to be an internal affair of Iraq. However, they would not be comfortable with a Shia dominated government in Iraq.

There is today a convergence of interests between

the American and the conservative Arab rulers. Both fear that a Shia government in Iraq would have closer ties with Iran, Syria and Lebanon, where they are either ruling the country or playing a dominant role in the government. These governments are also opposed to the US policy of intervention in the region and they believe that the countries of the region should themselves settle the regional problems. The ouster of Saddam Hussein has created the

same situation as was developed after the Islamic revolution in Iran, when the conservative Arab rulers opposed to the Ba'athist regime of Saddam Hussein had to support Iraq in its war against Iran. The Iran-Iraq war has weakened the oil-rich Arab countries of the region. Later, Iraq's occupation of Kuwait forced yet another war that has made these oil-rich states increasingly dependent on US for political and security reasons. Now, with the occupation of Iraq,

the US has succeeded in maintaining its hegemony over the region. The Arab regimes do not have any option but to back the Americans in return for ensuring a government of their choice in Iraq. The Arab rulers may succeed in their game plan but that would further increase their dependence on the US and will not help the newly installed interim government to establish peace in Iraq.

CNDP in Action

Recently the Indian Doctors for Peace and Development (IDPD), a constituent of the CNDP, organised a number of seminars and workshops to promote the ideology of peace with the medical community as its specific target.

I. The Maharashtra State seminar on War, Violence and Health : A South Asian Perspective & the Role of Indian Doctors was held on 9th May 2004.

It was attended by 120 delegates at the city of Nasik in Maharashtra state. It called for lasting peace in the region so as to ensure security and to promote health, education and development of South Asia. The Maharashtra University of Health Sciences (MUHS) and the NDMVPS Medical College, Nasik jointly organized the event. Introducing the theme of the seminar Dr. Arun Mitra, General Secretary of the IDPD, informed that International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) has been in the forefront for prevention of all forms of conflicts. For its efforts the IPPNW was awarded Nobel Prize of Peace in the year 1985. IDPD as an affiliate of the IPPNW has been working for the cause since the year 1984. He dwelt at length on how this region, which attained independence just over five decades back continues to suffer abject economic deprivation on account of an ongoing arms race between India

and Pakistan. After the nuclear tests by the two countries in May 1998, the security scenario has further worsened and the arms race intensified. An important aspect of the seminar was participation of large number of students from different colleges in the state including NDMVPS Medical College, Armed Forces Medical College (AFMC), Motiwala Homoeopathic Medical College and Alibaug KVS Homoeopathic Medical College.

II. IDPD recently organised an interactive session of medical students in Amritsar on Peace, Health and Development on the 24th June this year. This was done in collaboration with the Department of Community Medicine, Government Medical College, Amritsar. Students came also from distant Nasik in Maharashtra. Two sessions were held and extensive debates took place on the issue of causes and effects of conflicts/violence and the method to resolve them. Students overwhelmingly felt that steps must be taken by Indian and Pakistani governments to abolish nuclear weapons, check the proliferation of small arms, put an end to the arms trade and increase people's exchange programmes for confidence building. They decided to work mover vigorously for peace in the region.

III. Concerned with the nuclear weaponisation of South Asia by India and Pakistan, which has led to intensification of arms

race in the region, the International Physicians for The Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) had planned a Dialogue With Decision Makers (DWD) both in India and Pakistan to impress upon them the health consequences of these weapons of mass destruction and thus the necessity of their complete abolition. Delegation of IPPNW visited Pakistan and India for over a week in February-March this year. The delegation included eminent doctors from Malaysia, Sweden, USA, Nepal and Sri Lanka representing IPPNW, Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR) and Physicians for Social Responsibility Nepal (PSRN). During their deliberations with the Indian and Pakistan leaders the delegation categorically pointed out the vacuity of the notion of (nuclear) deterrence. After a long gap since 1971, within less than a year of going nuclear, the Kargil war took place in early '99. That the 'minimum deterrence' has nothing 'minimum' about it and will only lead to vertical and horizontal proliferation was forcefully impressed upon. A book titled 'South Asia in Quest for Peace and Health' published jointly by the IDPD and the IPPNW was released at a well-attended and highly enriching seminar at the India International Centre, New Delhi on 'War, Violence and Health – South Asian Perspective' on 29h February as a part of the overall programme.

Documents

The following is the text of the declaration adopted and issued by the '2004 World Conference against A and H Bombs' recently held in Hiroshima on 1st and 2nd August, organised by Japan Council against A and H Bombs (Japan Gensuikyō). The CNDP was a participant in the conference. The declaration includes a call for an international signature campaign in the specific context of the forthcoming 2005 May NPT Review Conference.

Declaration of the International Meeting

2004 World Conference against A and H Bombs

Abolition of Nuclear Weapons, Now — Call for Worldwide Action and Solidarity

Assembled in Hiroshima, the first victim city in history to experience the tragedy of nuclear attack, we call on the people of the world to rise in action together to eliminate all nuclear weapons from the earth.

The Atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945 instantly destroyed the two cities, killed over 200,000 people by the end of the year and are now consuming lives, minds and livelihoods of the surviving victims even now! , 59 years later, leaving them in anxiety about the delayed effects that may appear over generations. The movement for the elimination of nuclear weapons has spread worldwide in response to the call of the Hibakusha that the humans cannot coexist with nuclear weapons. It has prevented the use of nuclear weapons many times over. Nevertheless, about 30,000 nuclear arms are still deployed and stockpiled around the world. Getting rid of this threat is an urgent duty.

With the deepening concern about the war on Iraq and its implications, the dangers of actual use of nuclear arms and about nuclear proliferation, the demand for the implementation of the “unequivocal undertaking” to accomplish the elimination of nuclear weapons, agreed upon by the nuclear weapons states at the 2000 NPT Review Conference, is gathering momentum. Many nuclear powers, however, are resisting this call.

The US Bush administration, in particular, is going against this undertaking. It

promotes the so-called “preemptive attack” strategy, which includes the use of nuclear weapons as an option. The aim is to impose an “order of force”, even by using force to overthrow governments that refuse to comply with the US dominance under the cover of “countering terrorism”, or removing “the danger of the proliferation of WMD”. On the other hand, it is not only maintaining its own massive nuclear arsenals, but it is also engaging in the research and development of “mini-nukes” and other “usable” nuclear weapons, the possibility of resuming underground nuclear tests, in the missile defense program and the weaponization of outer space. As evidenced by the war on Iraq, the policy of “rule of force” is posing an actual new threat to our world in the 21st century.

If a nuclear superpower attempts to dictate to the world by force with its nuclear arsenals, the principles of the UN Charter on the peaceful solution of international conflicts and equality between nations will be completely destroyed. However, the unlawful war on Iraq and the subsequent occupation have met the concerted voice of “NO!” from the overwhelming majority of people around the world and of many governments. Diverse movements for a new world order based on peace and justice are in progress. As proved by this development, our time is no longer one where the outrages like the ones above can prevail.

Now is the time to take action to create a peaceful world without nuclear weapons. Let us prevent the use or threat of nuclear weapons and demand that the

abolition of nuclear weapons be fulfilled. This will open a way to the fundamental resolution of the danger of the new development or proliferation of nuclear weapons. The six-party talks on North Korea’s nuclear weapons programme is an example that shows that the peaceful resolution of the problem of nuclear weapons development is possible.

Among the US allies and the nuclear weapons states, some actions have been taken recently in favour of the effort for peace and the abolition of nuclear weapons. Further progress is possible if the grassroots movements, NGOs, and national and local governments develop their cooperation to reach this goal, while fulfilling their own roles. We call on all peace-loving people of the world to join actions to accomplish the abolition of nuclear weapons, on which the survival of the human race depends. Such developments will help to accelerate the process of establishing world peace and security based on the UN Charter.

Learning from the past war of aggression and from the experience of the A-bomb tragedies, Japan has upheld pacifism and the non-nuclear weapons principle. The current move towards the revision of the Constitution and the review of the “Three Non-nuclear Principles” is causing deep concern among the peoples of Asia and the rest of the world. At a time when the resolution of international disputes by peaceful means is most needed, the revision of the peace Constitution, which laid the renunciation of war as Japan’s basic principle and gave Japan an internationally pioneering role, will

run counter to the major direction of the development in Asia and the world.

The background of this move is a campaign to make Japan, under the Japan-US military alliance, take an active part in US initiated wars. This would lead to further consolidation of Japan as a base for nuclear blackmail and nuclear attack. It is vital for peace in Asia and the rest of the world that Japan retain its peace Constitution and that the "Three Non-Nuclear Principles" continue to play an active role so that the only A-bombed country can lead in achieving the elimination of nuclear weapons.

Towards the NPT Review Conference ! in May 2005 and further to the 60th year of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki tragedies in August of the same year, let us build up momentum in both the peace movement and public opinion with the common slogan: "Abolition of Nuclear Weapons, Now!" The initiative of the Mayors for Peace, which proposes a major action in New York on May 1 and a variety of other actions are already in place. We support these initiatives aimed at abolition, and call for global action in solidarity to reach our common goal.

We demand that the nuclear weapons states, both declared and undeclared, make plans for the abolition of their nuclear arsenals and set about implementing them without any further delay, doing away with the use or threat or development of nuclear weapons. We call on all governments to put forth every effort to start and complete negotiations for an international agreement for the abolition of nuclear weapons. We further urge that they vote in support of the resolutions that call for the elimination of nuclear weapons in the coming session of the UN General Assembly, thus renewing the determination for abolition and taking concrete steps toward it. The "nuclear umbrella" should be renounced and nuclear weapons deployed in foreign territories must be removed.

Let us develop the signature campaign in support of the call: "Abolition of Nuclear Weapons, Now - Let there be no more Hiroshimas and no more Nagasakis", initiated by the 2003 World Conference and widely supported by many peoples, organisations and government leaders. Towards the 2005 NPT Review Conference, let us build many creative actions all around the world, including joint presentation of signatures and peace marches.

The course of the 21st century will be determined by the actions of people supported by the

world public opinion. Grassroots actions in each country are the key. Let us strengthen our solidarity with the Hibakusha of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the victims of the Bikini test and other nuclear victims in the world. Let us create a global movement to make 2005, the 60th year of the atomic bombing, a year of international action to achieve a decisive turn toward liberating humanity from the horror of nuclear weapons.

The form for the signature campaign, as referred above, is as under :

Abolish Nuclear Weapons Now!

Let there be no more Hiroshimas and no more Nagasakis

It will soon be 60 years since the two cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were instantly reduced to ashes by atom bombs in August 1945. The cry of the Hibakusha that "the tragedy should never be repeated" has spread to become a worldwide call for the abolition of nuclear weapons.

Yet even now, tens of thousands of nuclear weapons still threaten the survival of humanity. The United States led the war on Iraq, and is now preparing more wars and even threatening to use nuclear weapons. These moves are causing deep anxiety throughout the world.

Unilateral attack against other countries is a violation of the rules of the UN Charter governing international peace. Above all, the use of nuclear weapons is a crime against humanity. It would cause unimaginable human suffering.

In May 2000, the nuclear weapons states agreed on an "unequivocal undertaking" to accomplish the elimination of nuclear weapons. In order to eliminate the danger of nuclear war and to frustrate new efforts to obtain nuclear weapons, this undertaking should be implemented without delay.

To make 2005, the 60th year of the A-bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, a turning point for a world without nuclear weapons and war, where the peace principles of the UN Charter are respected, we call on:

- The governments of the nuclear weapons states to neither use, threaten to use nor to develop nuclear weapons, and to take immediate steps for their abolition; and

- The governments of all countries to take action for the conclusion of an international treaty for the abolition of nuclear weapons.

Name	Address	Signature
-------------	----------------	------------------

--	--	--

Clippings from International Press

TEARING DOWN THE WALL: CALL FOR A GLOBAL CAMPAIGN

Dr. Chandra Muzaffar

President, International Movement for a Just world (JUST), Malaysia

It should surprise no one that Israeli Prime Minister, Ariel Sharon, is determined to proceed with the building of the West Bank wall which the World Court had ruled was a violation of international law and should therefore be torn down. Sharon's haughty stance is typical of the arrogance and the intransigence of a regime which has consistently defied international public opinion in pursuit of its oppressive and inhuman policies towards the Palestinian people.

For the Palestinians and indeed, for all human beings everywhere who cherish justice and freedom, the World Court decision of 9 July 2004 is a great moral victory. In a non-binding opinion, the Court not only asked Israel to dismantle those parts of the wall built upon Palestinian territory occupied by Israel since 1967 but it also suggested that "the United Nations and especially the

General Assembly and the Security Council should consider what further action is required to bring to an end the illegal situation resulting from the construction of the wall. "It has also ordered Israel to pay reparations to Palestinians directly impacted by the wall and to return land seized for its construction. It is significant this landmark verdict had the support of 14 out of the 15 judges on the Court's panel; the only dissenting voice was American judge, Thomas Buergenthal.

The Arab and other members of the Non Aligned Movement (NAM) who had brought the issue of the wall to the attention of the World Court have already expressed their intention to table a resolution in the UN General Assembly to censure Israel and to apply moral pressure on it to dismantle the wall. Armed with a strong General Assembly resolution they hope to persuade

the Security Council to adopt sanctions against Israel to compel her to comply with the wishes of the World Court, the UN General Assembly and the international community. They know of course that the United States is very likely to use its veto power in the Security Council to thwart any attempt to punish Israel.

This is why in the end it is global civil society which will have to give meaning and substance to the World Court decision. Once the UN avenues have been exhausted, civil society groups from all over the world should come together to launch a global campaign against the illegal wall. The campaign should be part of a larger effort to end Israeli occupation and control of the West Bank and Gaza and to establish a genuinely independent and sovereign Palestinian state, alongside Israel.

Membership Form

Annual Membership Fee: Students Rs. 20,
Individuals Rs. 100, Organisations Rs. 500

Name:

Organisation:

Address:

Phone:

e-mail:

Please mail your Draft/Cheque, drawn in favour of "PEACE-CNDP", payable at New Delhi, to

CNDP

A-124/6, Katwaria Sarai, New Delhi 110 016

CNDP

The Coalition for Nuclear Disarmament and Peace (CNDP) is India's national network of over 200 organisations, including grassroots groups, mass movements and advocacy organisations, as well as individuals. Formed in November 2000, CNDP demands that India and Pakistan roll back their nuclear weapons programmes. Our emphasis:

- No to further nuclear testing
- No to induction and deployment of nuclear weapons
- Yes to global and regional nuclear disarmament

CNDP works to raise mass awareness through schools and colleges programmes, publications, audio and visual materials, and campaigning and lobbying at various levels.

CNDP membership is open to both individuals and organisations. So if you believe nuclear weapons are evil and peace is important, fill in the Membership Form!

For Private Circulation Only

Published from A-124/6, Katwaria Sarai, New Delhi - 110 016.

Editor of this Issue: **Sukla Sen**