



*THE MAJORITY OPINION
Toward a Nuclear-Free World:
An Annual Assessment*

*in which representatives of the majority of the world
speak their truths about the state of our nuclear world*

*United Nations Day
October 24, 2002*

"It feels as though some kind of contract has been broken, some unspoken agreement guaranteeing that we in the North Atlantic world would be spared the majority human experience of insecurity and physical dread. What Faustian contract did we think had been made on our behalf? How could we imagine that, in a shrinking world, we could for ever postpone being touched by the majority experience? In the global village, fire can jump more easily from roof to roof."

*Rowan Williams
Archbishop-elect of Canterbury*

*An Atomic Mirror Production
By Janet Bloomfield and Pamela S. Meidell*

*Contact: The Atomic Mirror
PO Box 220, Port Hueneme, CA 93044, USA
Tel: + 1 805 985 5073 Fax: + 1 805 985 7563
E-mail: info@atomicmirror.org
www.atomicmirror.org*



Acknowledgements

in which we dedicate our efforts to inspiring colleagues, and thank all those who help us do our work

With this edition of our annual report on progress toward a nuclear-free world, we set out into uncharted territory. The world continues to change in predictable and unpredictable ways, challenging all of us to hold fast to our vision of a world where everyone's security concerns are taken into account on all levels of decision-making. It is increasingly clear that everything we do matters. How we do it is also crucial. As Rowan Williams states in the quote on our cover, "*in the global village, fire can jump more easily from roof to roof.*" It is also true that acts of compassion, mercy and justice are just as contagious. So we dedicate this report to those people everywhere who, mostly unseen and unknown, and often in circumstances of incredible pain and confusion, manage to act as beacons of transformation for all of us. In particular, we dedicate our efforts this year to 9/11 Families for Peaceful Tomorrows <www.peacefultomorrow.org/mssion.html> family members of those who perished in the terrorist attacks that we will never forget. Their cry: "*Our grief is not a call for war,*" continues to inspire us and humble us.

Great thanks to our contributors from around the world: Stacy Fritz from the United States, Bahig Nassar from Egypt, Jo Vallentine from Australia, Achin Vanaik from India/South Asia, Alla Yaroshinskaya from Russia. You responded quickly and with great clarity to our call. Thank you for your eyes, ears, minds and hearts in reporting from your regions.

Production of *The Majority Opinion* was made possible with financial support from the EarthWays Foundation and Beverly Pitts. Thank you! Previous report cards for 1996-2001, tracking annual progress toward a nuclear-free world, can be seen under "annual reports" on the Abolition 2000 website at <www.abolition2000.org/reports/>

Copyright © 2002 The Atomic Mirror

Any or all parts of this report may be freely copied and distributed, with proper acknowledgement of the source. As a courtesy, please send copies containing any reprinted material to:

The Atomic Mirror
P.O. Box 220
Port Hueneme, CA 93044-0220 USA
Tel: 1 805 985 5073
Fax: 1 805 985 7563
Email: info@atomicmirror.org
www.atomicmirror.org

Designed by Clare Yerbury, c y graphics and training
Written and compiled by Janet Bloomfield and Pamela S. Meidell
(with thanks to abolition colleagues for contributions, comments, and suggestions.)
The final responsibility for the content remains with the authors.

October 24, 2002

Janet Bloomfield <janet@atomicmirror.org> is the British Coordinator of the Atomic Mirror and a consultant to the Oxford Research Group in Oxford, England; Pamela S. Meidell <pamela@atomicmirror.org> is the Director of the Atomic Mirror and chair of the Disarmament Task Force of the Fellowship of Reconciliation. Both have been involved in efforts to create a nuclear-free world, including Abolition 2000, since the 1980s.

The Atomic Mirror is a project of the EarthWays Foundation www.earthways.org of Malibu, California, a 501(c)3 charitable and educational organization. The Atomic Mirror reflects the truths of our nuclear era and transforms them through creativity and the arts. The EarthWays Foundation acts as a catalyst for personal and global awareness and social and environmental activism.

*" Let the living
let us in,
before the
dead tear us
apart "*

From the song
"Worlds Apart" by
Bruce Springsteen

THE MAJORITY OPINION

Toward a Nuclear-Free World: An Annual Assessment

*in which representatives of the majority of the world speak their truths
about the state of our nuclear world*

The Unfinished Agenda

*what the countries left out when they agreed to grade themselves on
nuclear disarmament*

In the year 2000 at the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference, all of the countries that had signed the NPT agreed to a set of 13 "practical steps for the systematic and progressive efforts to implement" the disarmament obligations set forth in Article VI¹ of the treaty. With this one step, the countries themselves took up most of the agenda outlined by nuclear abolition groups around the world in the Abolition 2000 Statement of 1995.² Since 1996, this document, and the accompanying Moorea Declaration,³ has served as the criteria for grading the world on progress (or not) on nuclear abolition. Starting in 1996, the Atomic Mirror has produced a series of report cards⁴ tracking a diminishing effort by the world in getting rid of nuclear weapons. We are not doing well. Now that the countries themselves have committed to report on a regular basis their compliance with the 13 disarmament steps they have agreed⁵, nuclear abolition groups have the opportunity to focus on The Unfinished Agenda, i.e. those points not taken up. In this report, we focus on the two main points neglected by the countries, but outlined in the Abolition 2000 Statement:

Point #11: *Create mechanisms to ensure the participation of citizens and NGOs in planning and monitoring the process of nuclear weapons abolition.*

The Moorea Declaration (which states in part): *Colonized and indigenous peoples have, in the large part, borne the brunt of ... nuclear devastation... [Therefore,] indigenous and colonized peoples must be central... in decisions relating to the nuclear weapons cycle—and especially in the abolition of nuclear weapons in all aspects. The inalienable right to self-determination, sovereignty and independence is crucial in allowing all peoples of the world to join in the common struggle to rid the planet forever of nuclear weapons.*

Obviously, these two ideas are deeply connected: the involvement of citizens in monitoring and keeping alive their democracies (especially in the current world climate), and the need for the decolonization⁶ of us all in the process toward a nuclear-free world. Given the surging activism of the peoples and citizen groups of the world on the issues of globalization, the environment, peace and war, these two points are crucial in our own efforts. We will use them as a lens to look at other parts of The Unfinished Agenda. In this effort, we give center stage to the voices of our colleagues from the majority world⁷, a world that fervently desires the elimination of nuclear weapons.

¹ Article VI states: *Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.*

² See www.abolition2000.org/ablstate.html

³ www.abolition2000.org/resolutions/Moorea.html

⁴ See www.abolition2000.org/reports/

⁵ See www.un.org/Depts/dda/WMD/2000FD.pdf, pp. 20-21.

⁶ We are using the term "decolonization" here to mean the need to free humanity and life on earth from colonization by the nuclear enterprise. See the Recommendations under the Moorea Declaration at the end of this report.

⁷ The "majority world:" a term coined at the end of the Cold War to include the 80% of the world population who are not part of the North American system.

Regional Reports from The Majority World

*in which we hear from our global colleagues
(i.e., we multilateralize our dialogue...)*

In an era of US unilateralism, we believe it is crucial to bring forward the voices from many parts of our world. We asked our colleagues to address these two overlooked points with respect to the realities of life in their regions, specifically: How do you ensure the participation of citizens (including indigenous and/or colonized peoples) and NGOs in your nuclear abolition campaigns and activities? How do you address the issue of decolonization, i.e. what are you doing in your region to free people from reliance⁸ on nuclear weapons, and their production? What support do you need or can you offer? What specific proposals do you recommend?

Australia:

In our region, the anti-nuclear and anti-war communities work closely together, opposing uranium mining, nuclear and depleted uranium weapons production, and Australia's very close military alliance with the United States. Our country is laced with uranium deposits. In our campaigns, we honor the rights of the aboriginal peoples, who are the traditional owners of the land, by supporting them, and working with sympathetic legislators to enact laws to protect them. A bill currently before the Western Australia State parliament would ban all further uranium mining, the transport of nuclear material, and international dumping of radioactive materials. If enacted, it would effectively make Western Australia a nuclear-free state.⁹

On the federal level, we are looking to two Greens senators to initiate legislation blocking Pangea, the international nuclear waste-dumping consortium, from turning Australia into one of the world's nuclear waste dumps. Community education about the dangers of transporting such material across the high seas is required to ensure that it doesn't become a reality. Australia all too often sides with the US in UN debates and votes on nuclear issues. Anything that challenges US nuclear supremacy is a "go-extremely-carefully zone" for Australian Governments of either the ultra-conservative or the moderately conservative kind.

The nuclear industry, a misguided experiment of the twentieth century, is the granddaddy of globalization. Its international cartel, from the 1940s on, has demonstrated how an industry can work together for its own benefit, beyond the confines of national governments, and most often, with their support—strongly motivated by both profit and power. In its attempts to lie its way into the hearts and minds of the world's people, it has failed. It is our responsibility as citizens of the twenty-first century to see

that the demise of this ghastly industry is speedy and conclusive. For that we need international solidarity, which is forthcoming largely because the deceptions and the pain caused by the nuclear industry are universal. Surely, our first step is to stop producing more contaminated material to add to the huge stockpile.

Jo Vallentine
former Green Senator and member, Anti-Nuclear Alliance of
Western Australia, Australia

Europe:

Since the election of the Bush administration, a widening rift has been developing between Europe and the United States. The row over the International Criminal Court highlighted the differences, with Europe in favor of a strong legal forum to put war criminals and others on trial, and the United States strongly resisting the idea on the basis of a desire to protect its perceived national interests above all else. Most European governments, with the support of their populations are committed to maintaining and developing the multilateral structures created after the Second World War. They see these as vital to international stability and peace. The dramatic result of the recent elections in Germany, which was won by Chancellor Schroeder only after he repudiated the United States' drive to war against Iraq, presages the possibility of a rift across the Atlantic which could completely transform global politics. Only the British government seems to be willing to stand "shoulder to shoulder" with the Bush administration over Iraq. In this they do not have the support of the British public.

Europe still remains a nuclear continent. Britain and France continue to maintain and invest in the development of nuclear weapons. US nuclear weapons are still stationed in Belgium, Britain, Germany, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands and Turkey. European activists have been among the most

⁸ *We assert that currently we are all held hostage to nuclear weapons as instruments of public policy, both foreign and domestic. In this sense, we all rely on nuclear weapons for our security.*

⁹ *The 13 points also leave out the expansion of existing or creation of new nuclear free zones as preventive disarmament measures. See the Recommendations under What Shall We Do? at the end of this report.*

determined in using the International Court of Justice advisory opinion of 1996 to challenge the illegality of nuclear weapons installations. Thousands of people have taken action in Scotland against the Trident nuclear submarine system, and in Belgium against NATO.

Janet Bloomfield
British Coordinator, The Atomic Mirror, Britain

India/South Asia:

The world remains very much under the nuclear shadow. Barring the first few years after the end of the Cold War (when genuine steps towards actual nuclear disarmament and not just arms management were being made) in the post-Cold War period now unfolding, the dangers of nuclear war are even greater, albeit different, from what they were during that past. Then the justified fear was of a global holocaust. Now it is of a regional or 'limited' nuclear war or exchange. Supporters of nuclear weapons in India do not want to believe this reality. On the contrary, they want to use the example of that Cold War past, as the reassurance that we need not fear the use of nuclear weapons now. Deterrence assured peace then, so it will do so now! Nuclear peace was not the result of deterrence but much more because of the existence of a nuclear taboo established by the very horror of what happened at Hiroshima and Nagasaki 57 years ago. The longer this taboo lasted—and credit here must go to the much derided peace movements and to the general public sentiment that viewed these instruments of war as uniquely evil—the more difficult it became to break the taboo. Now, it is a very different situation...

" Nuclear peace was not the result of deterrence but much more because of the existence of a nuclear taboo established by the very horror of what happened at Hiroshima and Nagasaki 57 years ago. "

There are three possible positions one can take regarding the prospects of a nuclear war in South Asia arising from an India-Pakistan conventional military conflict escalating into a nuclear exchange. The first view, widespread outside India and Pakistan among both pro-nuclearists and anti-nuclearists, is that such an exchange sometime in the future between the two countries is almost inevitable. A second view is that the danger of this is so small it is negligible. This is certainly the position of most of those in India who supported India going nuclear. Interestingly, among Pakistani supporters of

the bomb there is a greater degree of pessimism with a greater proportion, who even as they support Pakistan's acquisition of the bomb, are fearful that there could well be a nuclear exchange between the two countries. There is, of course, a third position that is far and away the most sober one—the possibility of a nuclear exchange is not negligible nor inevitable but in-between; that is to say, it is a real-case scenario, not just a worst-case one, and that its likelihood varies depending on how serious conjunctural tensions are between the countries. Short of again creating a disarmament momentum, it will be folly to think that over the next 57 years, nuclear weapons will not be used. (excerpted from "Unlimited Damage" by Achin Vanaik, *The Telegraph*, Calcutta, September 10, 2002.)

Achin Vanaik
The Coalition for Nuclear Disarmament and Peace, India

Middle East:

In the Middle East, the only way to involve broad masses of people in disarmament campaigns is to highlight the interrelationship between the arms build up and the arms race with the current economic, political, and national clashes of interests. These activities lead to wars and military conflicts, and consequently underscore the necessity of disarmament, nuclear and conventional, as a major factor for the solution of people's problems. Disarmament in this case is not merely technical measures leading to a model of zero nuclear weapons, but a socio-political phenomenon. Therefore, the disarmament measures stipulated by the documents of NPT Conferences must be tightly connected to the steps necessary to eliminate political, economic and social causes of wars and military conflicts. This approach will help bring the basic interests of people to the core of our campaigns. One of the best ways to address this core issue is to transform the Middle East into a zone free from all weapons of mass destruction, together with their delivery systems¹⁰. Such a step will free the Middle East from Israeli nuclear weapons, and weapons of mass destruction (WMD) that may be acquired by other states of the region. It will also deal a severe blow to the US Nuclear Posture Review (NPR)¹¹ which lays out contingency plans to target several Middle Eastern states with nuclear weapons¹². Instead of US aggression, the only assured way to prevent the proliferation of WMD is to free the region from these weapons. The political will necessary for this reality to happen will only manifest itself when efforts to free the Middle East from all WMD are tied to efforts to provide basic needs to the people of the region.

Bahig Nassar
Coordinator of Arab Coordination Center of NGOs, Egypt

¹⁰ See the 16 steps pertaining to Regional Issues in the final document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference www.un.org/Depts/dda/WMD/2000FD.pdf, pp.23-25. Parties to the NPT also approved this idea at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference.

¹¹ See www.wslfweb.org/nuke/npr.htm for complete text of NPR.

¹² In the current climate, the real threat is war in Iraq and the possible use of nuclear weapons by Israel. The US NPR calls for the US, in this scenario, to retaliate with nuclear bombs against Iraq, with unimaginable consequences and disaster all around.

Russia:

The world was shaken twice in the last decade: once when the USSR dissolved, and once when terrorists attacked the US on September 11. In the Gorbachev era, we actually lost our way to change the world for the better. We lost some wonderful possibilities to begin a process for deep reductions of the stockpile, and to eliminate nuclear weapons once and for all. Now one of the main obstacles to achieving a nuclear-free world is the new US Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). What can we do? Leaders are still sure that peace is possible because their countries have nuclear weapons. I am sure nuclear threats and nuclear weapons are the last argument of weak, stressed and irresponsible politicians. People must act very quickly to stop the movement to nuclear war. But Russian people do not wish to spend money for new weapons of mass destruction; Russian people wish to build a new peaceful life after years of the Communists' totalitarian regime and many years of transition-period chaos. Russia today wishes to build its civil economy, not military industry. But the US NPR and the US deployment of space-based national missile defense (NMD) will provoke Russia to build new nuclear armaments. Combined with NATO expansion (to the Russian border), these US initiatives will break down the whole world order, and every nation will pay their own political and economic price for that nuclear apartheid.

Alla Yaroshinskaya PhD
former advisor to President Yeltsin, current advisor to Mikhail Gorbachev, Russia

The United States:

In an era when the US unilateral policies sail forth on a regular basis, US citizens need to remember more than ever their responsibilities as citizens—of the US and of the world. We live in a democracy, and we must practice it on a regular basis or risk losing it. Citizen groups in the US, meeting to craft a nuclear abolition campaign in the heart of the beast, drafted a document entitled "Democracy, Power and Nuclear Weapons." Here are some excerpts:

"Organizing to abolish nuclear weapons is a significant moral and ethical undertaking that inherently defies the status quo. Because nuclear weapons are so closely bound to the power of the governments that hold them, promoting open public debate regarding nuclear weapons policies requires us to question state authority directly. Thus, efforts to abolish nuclear weapons can lead to citizens reclaiming sovereignty over society's decision-making processes, and hence to an expansion and reinvigoration of democracy... The process for getting rid of the bomb will both require and make possible increased openness, truthfulness, cooperation and citizen participation. ... Nuclear weapons, like slavery, are symptoms of social degradation and a climate of fear and

confusion which have much deeper roots. History teaches today's Abolitionists (here we refer to the slavery abolitionists in the 19th Century who we recognize as our forebears) that the road to world security, justice, and to the abolition of nuclear weapons must lead as well to a fundamental reconstruction of our economy and our politics.¹⁵

Many voices of resistance cry out around the United States. In Nevada, despite decades of persistent protest and opposition, the US government continues to conduct various kinds of nuclear weapons tests on Western Shoshone land and has plans to bury the nation's nuclear waste there. First steps in siting National Missile Defenses in Alaska met citizen opposition, as we hear from the far North:

The state of Alaska needs increased citizen involvement in planning and monitoring the nuclear weapons industry. Information is the first step in ensuring citizen involvement in a robust democracy and in abolishing nuclear weapons. Historically, the nuclear and defense industries have taken advantage of the size and remoteness of Alaska for their most dangerous testing and experiments. The environment, upon which many indigenous peoples depend for subsistence, already has widespread negative impacts from decades of military pollution. Today, the people of this state are purposefully kept uninformed about Missile Defense Agency activities that could endanger them. Promoting educated opposition to missile defense in Alaska by disseminating critical information is the primary goal of No Nukes North.

An excellent model of how communities can work together to gain some control over the nuclear industry's actions did evolve during the past year. An investigative journalist in Fairbanks exposed a secret Missile Defense Agency plan to launch Scud missiles from the University's rocket research facility. This information resulted in public knowledge of the project's risks and the true safety record of the launch facility, and raised questions about future Missile Defense Agency projects. Subsequently, there was enough support within the University to set up a diverse panel of faculty and community leaders to review and make recommendations to accept or reject each proposed classified military project, based partially on if and how projects would serve local residents.

NGOs had to sue the Department of Defense to enforce adherence to the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) laws for new Alaska missile defense sites. Meaningful observance of those laws and respect for their intent would benefit citizens, the land, and the public's trust in their defenders, yet the national trend of increasing secrecy and exemptions from environmental standards has direct negative impacts on both environment and attitudes.

Stacy Fritz
No Nukes North, Alaska, USA

¹⁵ See www.wslfweb.org/abolition/demo.htm for complete document.

The Way Forward

in which we set forth three specific proposals for action

1 What Shall We Do? The Unfinished Agenda Expands..

Our regional rapporteurs' comments revealed yet additional items ignored by the countries that agreed to the 13 points of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. All three of these points have a crucial bearing on current events in our world:

Immediately make an unconditional pledge not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons. (#2 of the Abolition 2000 Statement) One strategy for dealing with potential nuclear terrorism and "rogue states" would be to stop threatening nuclear use (as the US does in the NPR), especially against countries that don't have or haven't been shown to have nuclear weapons. Public diplomacy is not enhanced with such a stance. How can we work together across borders to address the ultimate injustice of the NPR and the shift in US policy from deterrence to preemptive strikes?

Subject all weapons-usable radioactive materials and nuclear facilities in all states to international accounting, monitoring, and safeguards, and establish a public international registry of all weapons-usable radioactive materials. (#6 of the Abolition 2000 Statement) The problem of "loose nukes" and potential terrorist access to nuclear materials could be minimized immensely with the common sense move to create a single standard of nuclear accounting. Such an act would give weapons inspections real credibility in all quarters. How do we ensure that this inventory takes place?

Create additional Nuclear-Weapons-Free Zones (NWFZ) such as those established by the treaties of Tlatelolco and Rarotonga. (#8 of the Abolition 2000 Statement) The world's Nuclear Weapons Free Zones form the heart of the untold success story of the road to a nuclear-free world; they are one of our best hopes for bringing it into being. Currently, NWFZ treaties cover nearly half the globe (most of the global Southern Hemisphere): Treaty of Rarotonga (South Pacific), Treaty of Tlatelolco (South America), Treaty of Bangkok (Southeast Asia), Treaty of Pelindaba (Africa). NWFZs in the Middle East, South Asia, Northeast Asia, Central Asia, and Central Europe are currently under discussion at the UN and in respective regions. It's a glaring omission that the states parties to the NPT left out such a likely path to our goal. Our majority opinion contributors see NWFZs as preventive disarmament measures that could be negotiated by regional bodies as a way of taking action without the need for US involvement. In the US itself (which has never acknowledged the genocidal nature of its foundations with respect to the original inhabitants of the land), First Peoples have been successful in enacting the lion's share of the region's NWFZs. Citizen groups of all persuasions can build on these successful initiatives.

" There was tremendous flexibility in the immediate years after the wall came down, but the tragedy is that there was nobody there to notice.

Imagine, the Emperor came out of the East and said:

'I'm naked.' And we had no plan for this... "

John Le Carre

2 How Shall We Do It? Democracy, Dialogue, Direct Action

It's all well and good to lay out what should happen. But the real question remains: How is it going to happen? Joseph Rotblat, in his critique of the US Nuclear Posture Review¹⁴, cites the immorality and rampant destruction of nuclear weapons as ethical imperatives for abolishing them. But Bahig Nassar argues that, like the goals reiterated above, *"these are already among the main bases which NGOs have been adopting in their campaigns for many years. Yet these campaigns get nowhere."* He's right. Where are we? This analysis begs disarmament/abolition NGOs to conduct a serious and thoroughgoing assessment and critique of ourselves, especially in light of the anti-globalization campaigns of the last few years. Clearly, people will act when they perceive that their interests are ignored. How they take action is as important as the actions they take. We propose the following approach: democracy, dialogue, direct action.

In engaging with our democracies, we need to recapture politics from the politicians. We need to recapture it for the people, and recognize that politics is what we are practicing. Politics, as a full public discourse that engages all citizens, has been atrophying for too long in the comfortable democracies of the North. Notice the word, "discourse." That means talk, as in talk to your neighbors, to your elected representatives, to people on the street and to people standing in line at the post office. Have a dialogue, air the issues that concern you, practice freedom of speech. And then embark on the next step of reclaiming our democracies. As Mary Kaldor of the Centre for the Study of Global Governance at the London School of Economics says: *"What is needed, above all, is a political project based on inclusion, democracy, and the international rule of law. Such a project can supplant the exclusivist political thinking that leads to war; it does not offer technical solutions but changes the way people perceive the world. This is just as important in the societies that are considered peaceful, such as the United States or Europe, as in the regions currently engulfed by war... But the task of grassroots activists is not to educate (or miseducate) the public about technical approaches; the task is to change global consciousness."*

Nothing is better at changing people's consciousness than creative, non-violent direct action. One of the most innovative campaigns on the planet is currently underway in a quiet loch on Scotland's west coast: the Trident Ploughshares campaign, aiming to rid Britain of its Trident submarines and their nuclear weapons. Using the legal and moral weight of the 1996 World Court Judgement¹⁵ Trident Ploughshares 2000¹⁶ is an open, accountable and non-violent campaign that has involved thousands of people in action. It organises regular large acts of resistance at the UK Trident base at Faslane. Since Trident Ploughshares 2000 was formally launched on May 2nd, 1998 over 1800 people have signed the Pledge to Prevent Nuclear Crime and over 1700 people have been arrested with 277 trials having taken place. It has kept Trident in the public eye at a time when nuclear weapons have been low on the media agenda and given people a supportive framework within which to exercise their responsibilities as global citizens.

Another new global initiative developed in the wake of the highly publicized United Nations weapons inspections of Iraqi sites, and the 1996 ICJ opinion. Teams of citizens have taken up implementation of the ICJ opinion by attempting to conduct "citizen verification inspections" at nuclear sites around the world. Citing international law affirmed by the ICJ, these Citizen Inspection Teams inspect nuclear weapons facilities, with varying degrees of success, to ascertain whether illegal activities are continuing.¹⁷

We would further recommend the following steps: Increase citizen involvement by requiring all states to include NGO representatives in their delegations to future NPT PrepComs and Review Conferences. Bring the issue of nuclear abolition to other regional and international arenas, including bilateral talks between the nuclear weapons states. Continue to develop mechanisms to make the nuclear weapons states more accountable to their treaty obligations and to their citizens.

¹⁴ Speech given by Sir Joseph Rotblat at Bradford University on May 24, 2002.

¹⁵ On July 8th, 1996, the International Court of Justice in The Hague issued an Advisory Opinion declaring nuclear weapons to be "generally illegal," and required the nuclear weapons states to complete negotiations to get rid of them. See www.lcnp.org/wcourt/opinion.htm

¹⁶ See the website www.tridentploughshares.org

¹⁷ See www.lcnp.org/wcourt/Cit%20Weapons%20inspections.htm for a list of inspections.

3 The Moorea Declaration: Decolonizing Our Hearts and Minds

In using the term “decolonization” here, we remember the admonition of Gabriel Tetiarahi, our Maohi colleague in French-occupied Polynesia, to “Decolonize your minds!” We assert that the planet has been colonized by the nuclear enterprise and those responsible for it, since nuclear activities were undertaken in secret and therefore without consultation and the consent of the people. We are all colonized. We need to work in solidarity with our brothers and sisters of the indigenous lands and communities around the world, because they can teach us so much about what it means to decolonize our minds. They have the intimate experience and the awareness: they’ve been awake to colonization and we are just beginning to wake up to it. So, with the people of the Pacific (and especially the Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific movement), we agree that decolonization and denuclearization must go hand in hand.

With these reflections in mind, we propose the following recommendations: Return French-occupied Polynesia to the United Nations decolonization list. Hold the nuclear weapons states, and other responsible parties, legally accountable for the human and environmental consequences of usurping land and resources for nuclear enterprises. Honor the sovereignty of indigenous peoples, and uphold treaties made with them. Support the efforts of local, affected and indigenous peoples to restore the natural balance of their environments, and to preserve knowledge about nuclear materials for future generations. Decolonize our own minds and hearts.

To inspire us, we offer the following heartening example, which occurred during the writing of this report. On Wednesday, September 25, the US government returned Thule Air Force Base¹⁸ in Dundas, Greenland to the local citizenry. In three years, it will revert to the Inuit people¹⁹.

*“ The remedy is so simple. Just stop.
Dont add any more to the problem. ”*

Pilulaw Khus,
Elder, Bear Clan, Coastal Band, Chumash Nation

¹⁸ Site of several “near miss” nuclear accidents during the Cold War.

¹⁹ As reported by BBC World (radio) in an interview with Greenland’s Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs, Nikola Engle, September 25, 2002.

Last Words

In this report, we have set forth the views of a number of people who are not normally heard in the corridors of power. They represent the vast majority of the world's citizens whose basic needs for real human security in jobs, health and education are not being met. Let us reflect too, on Albert Einstein's words for Americans, spoken in 1921, which are still valid today. Speaking of his first impressions on a visit to US shores, the famous scientist described a state of affairs that is identical or perhaps even worse today. He said in a news interview for *Nieuwe Rotterdamsche Courant*:

"The United States is the most powerful among the technically advanced countries in the world today. Its influence on the shaping of international relations is absolutely incalculable. But America is a large country, and its people have so far not shown much interest in great international problems, among which the problem of disarmament occupies first place today. This must be changed, if only in America's own interest. The last war [WWI] has shown that there are no longer any barriers between the continents and that the destinies of all countries are closely interwoven. The people of this country must realize that they have a great responsibility in the sphere of international politics. The part of passive spectator is unworthy of this country and is bound in the end to lead to disaster all round."



GLOBAL OPINION POLL

The following opinion poll was conducted from February to March 2002 in Japan, the Republic of Korea (South Korea), the United States, Canada, Britain, France, Germany, Russia, India, Brazil and South Africa. It was conducted by the Liu Center for the Study of Global Issues at the University of British Columbia in cooperation with *The Asahi Shimbun* newspaper in Japan. The international research firm Ipsos-Reid fielded the survey. The survey canvassed the opinion of 6,036 respondents. Many thanks for the translation go to Hiro Umbayashi of the Pacific Center for Disarmament and Security in Yokohama, Japan.

Question: *How will the world be affected by the US Missile Defense Program?*

Answer:	safer %	more dangerous %
Brazil	16	80
Canada	42	52
France	25	69
Germany	32	59
India	43	29
Japan	21	59
Russia	15	55
South Africa	24	49
South Korea	18	74
UK	32	52
US	64	33
ALL	37	50

Question: *The nuclear holders should commit to no-first-use.*

Answer:	strongly agree %	agree to some extent %
Brazil	73	14
Canada	70	16
France	68	19
Germany	80	9
India	53	19
Japan	63	31
Russia	75	19
South Africa	45	24
South Korea	70	16
UK	64	19
US	62	17
ALL	66	19

Question: *The nuclear holders should commit to no-use to non-holders.*

Answer:	strongly agree %	agree to some extent %
Brazil	76	13
Canada	70	13
France	64	19
Germany	74	8
India	45	22
Japan	70	25
Russia	68	21
South Africa	53	23
South Korea	73	15
UK	69	13
US	58	18
ALL	65	18

Question: *All nations should sign a treaty to ban all nuclear weapons.*

Answer:	strongly agree %	agree to some extent %
Brazil	89	7
Canada	83	8
France	72	18
Germany	88	5
India	66	12
Japan	77	20
Russia	78	13
South Africa	53	22
South Korea	69	18
UK	72	12
US	61	15
ALL	65	18



" Recall the face of the poorest and most helpless man whom you may have seen and ask yourself if the step you contemplate is going to be of any use to him. Will he be able to gain anything by it? Will it restore him to a control over his own life and destiny? In other words, will it lead to swaraj (self-rule) for the hungry and also spiritually starved millions of our countrymen? "

Mohandas K. Gandhi

(known as The Gandhi Talisman and engraved at his house/ashram in New Delhi)