

3FEB

- EMBARGOED TO 5 FEB

SYDNEY

AUST, SANTA-BARBARA USA, MOSCOW RUSSIA

NOBEL

PRIZEWINNERS, PARLIAMENTARIANS, NGOS, IN APPEAL ON NUCLEAR
DISARMAMENT/MISSILE DEFENCE TO OBAMA, MEDVEDEV.

5

FEB-1ST ANIVERSARY OF NEW START ENTRY INTO FORCE

On

the first anniversary of the Entry-into-Force of New START, 85 prominent individuals (including 4 nobel prizewinners and one nobel prizewinning organisation) and major nongovernmental organisations have sent an appeal to Presidents Obama and Medvedev, Senate and Duma Committees, and key policy-makers, urging that US and NATO plans for missile defence must not be allowed to de-rail progress to nuclear disarmament and abolition.

The

letter was written and organised by David Krieger of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, Steven Starr of Physicians for Social Responsibility, former Soviet missile forces Colonel Valery Yarynich, IPPNW Co-President Sergei Kolesnikov, and John Hallam of People for Nuclear Disarmament.

It

arose from deep alarm generated when (after repeated warnings) Russian President Medvedev announced that Russian missile forces have been ordered to target NATO missile defence installations, and made it clear that further steps toward a NATO missile defence capability on Russia's borders could prompt Russia to pull out of future nuclear arms reduction talks and even out of the recently negotiated New START agreement, on whose first anniversary of Entry-into-force (5 Feb) the letter is being released.

The

first anniversary of New START should not be also its last. Rather, New START must become the basis from which rapid progress to zero nuclear weapons takes place.

Nobels, Parliamentarians, NGOs, in appeal on Missile Defence/Nuclear Disarmament

Written by John Hallam

Thursday, 02 February 2012 14:43 - Last Updated Sunday, 08 February 2015 22:25

According

to the letter, withdrawal from START would result in a re-creation of the perilous nuclear postures of the cold war, and an uncontrolled US-Russia nuclear arms race.

This

comes just weeks after the highly respected Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists has moved the hands of its 'doomsday clock' from six to five, minutes to midnight.

The

letter emphasises that a major US-Russia nuclear exchange, probably caused by accident or miscalculation, would, even now, destroy what we call 'civilisation', and make the planet uninhabitable for more than a decade for all complex living things.

To

this day, the US and Russia maintain some 1700 warheads each in a status in which they can be launched in less than two minutes, in spite of repeated calls by the UN to take them off high alert.

Getting

rid of nuclear weapons, the letter emphasises, is a priority for human (and other species) survival, a priority that must trump even the key security interests of major world powers. Failure to do that places a question – mark over our future as a species.

Contact:

John

Hallam, PND, Sydney, 61-2-9810-2598 0416-500-793 johnhallam2001@yahoo.com.au,

David

Krieger, NAPF, Santa Barbara, + 1 (805)

965-3443

Col

Valery Yarynich(30yrs Soviet Missile forces-Ret) Moscow, yvalery@mail.ru,

Sergei

Kolesnikov (CO-PRESIDENT IPPNW, PNND) sikolesnikov1@rambler.ru,

+7-985-7672990,

7-495-6985787

Steven

Starr, PSR, +1-(573) 884 1847

OPEN

LETTER ON NATO MISSILE DEFENSE PLANS AND NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

PRESIDENT
BARACK OBAMA
PRESIDENT
DMITRY MEDVEDEV

cc

Duma
and Senate Committees on Foreign Affairs and Defence
US
Secretaries of Defence and Foreign Affairs
Russian
Ministers of Defence and Foreign Affairs
All
Key Defence and Foreign Affairs decisionmakers

To

President Barack Obama and President Dmitry Medvedev:

Recent

U.S. decisions to deploy an integrated missile defense system in Western, Eastern and Southeastern Europe, coupled with the continued expansion of NATO and its military activities, have created increasingly sharp divisions and distrust between the Russian Federation and the United States.[i] This process now threatens to destroy the New START agreement and reverse previous progress toward the elimination of nuclear weapons. Further deterioration of U.S.-Russian relations could result in a return to the perilous nuclear postures of the Cold War.

Although

the “Phased Adaptive Approach” missile defense system is being installed under the auspices of NATO, it is perceived by Russia to be “a U.S. system on European soil.”[ii] This system is regarded with apprehension by Russia, particularly since later phases include plans to deploy very advanced-stage Standard Missile-3 land-based interceptors, which have the potential to effectively target Russian strategic nuclear missiles. Russia consequently regards the proposed and ongoing deployments as no more than “an interim step toward building a full-scale missile defense system to provide guaranteed protection of U.S. territory against any missile attack.”[iii] □ □

The

official U.S. political rationale for these deployments is that they are necessary to defend against yet-to-be-developed Iranian long-range ballistic missiles. Yet American scientists have stated that forward-based European radar systems give the U.S. the ability

to track Russian ICBMs very early after a launch and to guide interceptors against them.[iv] Russian leaders have expressed specific concerns that the U.S./NATO missile defense system could be used for such a purpose and continue to question at whom the system is directed. □ □ Fundamental mutual distrust stems from the fact that both the U.S. and Russia still maintain strategic war plans that include large nuclear strike options, with hundreds of preplanned targets that clearly include cities in each other's nation.[v] Both nations keep a total of at least 1,700 strategic nuclear weapons mounted on launch-ready ballistic missiles, which can carry out these strike options with only a few minutes' warning. □ □

Thus,

many in Russia believe the final stages of deployment of the U.S./NATO missile defense system are designed to have the capability of greatly reducing or eliminating Russia's strategic nuclear deterrent.

Continued

technological advances in hypersonic missiles,[vi] which would greatly enhance interceptor missile capabilities, combined with the possibility that nuclear warheads could be installed in missile interceptors, will only serve to exacerbate Russian fears about U.S./NATO European missile defense.[vii]

Mutual

suspicion has prevented true cooperation in joint missile defense, just as it has with the still defunct U.S.-Russian Joint Data Exchange Center, which was supposed to share information about U.S. and Russian missile launches.[viii] The failure to include Russia in a joint missile defense also reflects the fact that NATO has not made Russia a full partner in the alliance, despite the end of the Cold War. □ □ It is only natural that Russia should consider NATO a potential threat, particularly since NATO has greatly expanded eastward, has actively recruited and included former members of the Warsaw Pact and has engaged in extensive military campaigns in Europe, Africa and South Asia. The combination of NATO expansion with the deployment of a massive missile defense system that surrounds Russia has triggered a strong political reaction in Russia.

From

a Russian perspective, a U.S./NATO missile defense system in Europe undermines their perceived nuclear deterrent, decreases U.S. vulnerability and increases Russian vulnerability to a U.S. nuclear first-strike attack. □ □

In

November, President Medvedev made his most forceful political statement against the U.S. and NATO to date.[ix]

Included

in the speech was a specific warning that Russia would withdraw from the New START agreement should the U.S./NATO missile defense system continue to move forward.

This

is not new information—the Russian Federation issued an unambiguous statement in April 2010 when New START was signed, making clear that both quantitative and qualitative limitations on the U.S. missile defense program were so essential that Russia would be prepared to withdraw from the treaty if these limitations were not honored.[x]

A

Russian withdrawal from New START would likely precipitate a fully-renewed nuclear arms race and thus completely reverse movement toward a world without nuclear weapons. Many of the signatories of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) would also regard the collapse of the New START process as an explicit violation of the NPT; this could lead to the collapse of the NPT and extensive nuclear proliferation.□

In

his November speech, President Medvedev also issued a number of explicit instructions to his military forces that essentially amounted to military threats against the U.S. and NATO. He stated, “I have instructed the Armed Forces to draw up measures for disabling missile defense system data and guidance systems, if need be [I]f the above measures prove insufficient, the Russian Federation System will employ modern, offensive weapon systems in the west and south of the country, ensuring our ability to take out any part of the missile defense system in Europe.”[xi]□ □

Although

many political analysts in the West have discounted this warning as merely a way to put pressure on the U.S. and NATO to change course, this statement by President Medvedev must be taken seriously. Russia will certainly carry out the directives of its President. □ □

The

leaders of the U.S., NATO and Russia must seriously consider the possibility that the current course of political events is pushing them towards an eventual military confrontation and conflict.

Further

expansion of NATO, its “nuclear umbrella” and missile defense system to the very borders of Russia increase the odds that any conventional military confrontation would quickly escalate into nuclear war.

If

Russia decided “to take out any part of the missile defense system in Europe,” as threatened by President Medvedev, would not such an action be likely to lead to nuclear conflict between the U.S. and Russia?

According

to recent peer-reviewed studies, the detonation of the launch-ready U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals could leave the Earth virtually uninhabitable for more than a decade.[xii] Such a war would lead to global famine and starvation of most of the human race.[xiii]

We

suggest the following steps, both as a way out of the immediate crisis and to advance the goal of a nuclear-weapons-free-world. These are not the only steps that could be helpful, but we are hopeful that leaders on both sides might be willing to act upon them:

There

should be a freeze on U.S./NATO deployment of missile defenses in Europe pending an open, joint U.S.-Russian quantitative assessment of the threats that missile defense is supposed to counter, and of the threats posed by U.S. and Russian tactical and strategic nuclear forces.[xiv] The threats posed by missile defense and its effectiveness should be studied and integrated into the previously-mentioned assessment. It is essential that this analysis include a thorough scientific evaluation of the long-term effects of nuclear conflict upon the global environment, climate and human agriculture.[xv]

It

is essential, not only for the creation of a peaceful and secure Europe but for the continuation of civilization and the human species itself, that launch-ready nuclear arsenals be immediately stood-down, that nuclear war be avoided, and that nuclear arsenals be eliminated. This is a priority that must trump all other priorities, including what are seen as the most pressing security priorities of major world powers.

We

reiterate strongly that differences of opinion over missile defense must not be allowed to de-rail progress to zero nuclear weapons, or worse, to put that progress into reverse and instead reinstate Cold War security postures, as would be precipitated by the collapse of New START.

In

pursuing a solution, it is vital that both sides feel their concerns are being respected and that their security interests have been properly taken into account. An outcome that advantages one side only, or that is perceived as doing so, is no solution at all.

The

elimination of nuclear weapons must take place not in some far-off

Written by John Hallam

Thursday, 02 February 2012 14:43 - Last Updated Sunday, 08 February 2015 22:25

utopian future, but at an early date, as demanded by the vast majority of the world's governments in resolution after resolution at the United Nations.

It is

quite clear that the ordinary citizens of every nation no longer wish to live under the shadow of imminent nuclear destruction and see no reason why massive nuclear arsenals should continue to exist when they clearly represent a self-destruct mechanism for the human race.

Signed:

Organizations

Action

des Citoyens pour le Désarmement Nucléaire (France) □ Artistes pour la Paix (Canada) □ Australian Anti-Bases Campaign Coalition (Australia) □ Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (UK) □ Canadian Pugwash Group (Canada) □ Daisy Alliance (USA) □ Footprints for Peace (Australia) □ Global Network Against Weapons & Nuclear Power in Space (USA) □ International Association of Peace Messenger Cities □ International Network of Engineers and Scientists for Global Responsibility □ International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War □ International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War - Kenya (Kenya) □ Just Peace Queensland (Australia) □ Los Alamos Study Group (USA) □ Medact (UK) □ Medical Association for Prevention of War (Australia) □ No2nuclearweapons (Canada) □ Nuclear Age Peace Foundation (USA) □ Pax Christi Metro New York (USA) □ Pax Christi Montreal (Canada) □ People for Nuclear Disarmament NSW (Australia) □ People for Nuclear Disarmament WA (Australia) □ Physicians for Global Survival (Canada) □ Physicians for Social Responsibility (USA) □ Project Ploughshares (Canada) □ Réseau Sortir du Nucléaire (France) □ Science for Peace (Canada) □ Scientists for Global Responsibility (UK) □ Swedish Peace Council (Sweden) □ Tri-Valley CAREs (USA) □ US Peace Council (USA) □ Veterans Against Nuclear Arms (Canada) □ West Midlands Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (UK) □ Women's International League for Peace and Freedom - U.S. Section (USA) □ Women's International League for Peace and Freedom - Vancouver (Canada)

Individuals

(Organizational affiliation for identification purposes only)

Lynn

Adamson (Co-Chair, Canadian Voice of Women for Peace, Canada) □

Nobels, Parliamentarians, NGOs, in appeal on Missile Defence/Nuclear Disarmament

Written by John Hallam

Thursday, 02 February 2012 14:43 - Last Updated Sunday, 08 February 2015 22:25

JanisAlton(Co-Chair, Canadian Voice of Women for Peace, Canada)□
Marcus
Atkinson(International Coordinator, Footprints for Peace, Australia)□
Amanda
Bresnan(Member, Australian Capital Territory Legislative Assembly,
Australia)□
Adele
Buckley(Executive Committee, Canadian Pugwash Group, Canada)□
Yousaf
Butt(Federation of American Scientists, USA)□
Helen
Caldicott(Co-Founder, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Australia)□
Lisa
Clark(Beati i Costruttori di Pace, Italy)□
Gill
Cox(West Midlands Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, UK)□
Phyllis
Creighton(Veterans Against Nuclear Arms, Canada)□ Wilfred
Dcosta(Indian Social Action Forum, India)□
Roberto
Della Seta(Member, Senate of the Republic, Italy)□
Dale
Dewar(Executive Director, Physicians for Global Survival, Canada)□
Kate
Dewes(Disarmament & Security Centre, New Zealand)□ Jayantha
Dhanapala(Former United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament,
1998-2003, Sri Lanka)□
Gabriele
Dietrich(National Alliance of People's Movements, India)□
Dennis
Doherty(Australian Anti-Bases Campaign Coalition, Australia)□
George
Farebrother(Secretary, World Court Project, UK)□ Gregor
Gable(Shundahai Network, USA)□
Bruce
K. Gagnon(Coordinator, Global Network Against Weapons & Nuclear Power in
Space, USA)□
Joseph
Gerson(American Friends Service Committee, USA)□
Bob
Gould(President, Physicians for Social Responsibility - San Francisco,
USA)□
Jonathan
Granoff(President, Global Security Institute, USA)□ Ulla
Grant(Hall Green Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, UK)□ Commander
Robert Green(Royal Navy, ret., New Zealand)□ Jenny

Nobels, Parliamentarians, NGOs, in appeal on Missile Defence/Nuclear Disarmament

Written by John Hallam

Thursday, 02 February 2012 14:43 - Last Updated Sunday, 08 February 2015 22:25

Grounds(President, Medical Association for Prevention of War, Australia)[]
Mark
Gubrud(University of North Carolina, USA)[]
Luis
Gutierrez-Esparza(Latin American Circle of International Studies, Mexico)[]
Regina
Hagen(Darmstädter Friedensforum, Germany)[]
John
Hallam(People for Nuclear Disarmament, Australia)[]
David
Hartsough(PEACEWORKERS, USA)[]
John
Hinchcliff (President,
Peace Foundation, New Zealand)[] Herbert
J. Hoffman(Vice President, Maine Veterans for Peace Chapter 001, USA)[]
Inge
Höger(Member of Parliament, Germany)[]
Kate
Hudson(General Secretary, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, UK)[]
Cesar
Jaramillo(Program Officer, Project Ploughshares, Canada)[] Pierre
Jasmin(President, Artistes pour la Paix, Canada)[]
Birgitta
Jónsdóttir(Member of Icelandic Parliament and the NATO Parliamentary Assembly,
Iceland)[]
Martin
Kalinowski(Chairman, Carl Friedrich von Weizsäcker Centre for Science and
Peace Research, Germany)[]
Sergei
Kolesnikov(Member of Russian Parliament and President of the Russian affiliate
of IPPNW, Russia)[]
David
Krieger(President, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, USA)[] Harry
Kroto(Nobel Laureate in Chemistry, USA)[]
Steve
Leeper(Chairman, Hiroshima Peace Culture Foundation, Japan)[]
Mairead
Maguire(Nobel Peace Laureate, Peace People, N. Ireland)[]
Ak
Malten(Pro Peaceful Energy Use, Netherlands)[]
Willem
Malten(Director, Los Alamos Study Group, USA)[]
Alfred
Marder(International Association of Peace Messenger Cities, USA)[]
Bronwyn
Marks(Hiroshima Day Committee, Australia)[]

Nobels, Parliamentarians, NGOs, in appeal on Missile Defence/Nuclear Disarmament

Written by John Hallam

Thursday, 02 February 2012 14:43 - Last Updated Sunday, 08 February 2015 22:25

Jean-Marie

Matagne(President, Action des Citoyens pour le Désarmement Nucléaire, France)□

Ibrahim

Matola(Member of Parliament, Malawi)□

Lisle

Merriman(Palestine-Israel Network, USA)□

Natalia

Mironova(President, Movement for Nuclear Safety, Russia)□

Sophie

Morel(Board member, Réseau Sortir du Nucleaire, France)□

Peter

Murphy(Coordinator, SEARCH Foundation, Australia)□ Abdul

Nayyar(President, Pakistan Peace Coalition, Pakistan)□ David

Norris (Senator,

Ireland)□

Rosemarie

Pace(Director, Pax Christi Metro New York, USA)□ Sergei

Plekhanov(Professor, York University, Canada)□

Pavel

Podvig(Russian Nuclear Forces Project, Russia)□

John

Polanyi(Nobel Laureate in Chemistry, USA)□

Barney

Richards(New Zealand Peace Council, New Zealand)□ Bob

Rigg(Former Chair, New Zealand National Consultative Committee on Peace and Disarmament, New Zealand)□

Bruce

A. Roth(Daisy Alliance, USA)□

Joan

Russow(Global Compliance Research Project, Canada)□ Kathy

Wanpovi Sanchez(Tewa Women United, USA)□

Mamadou

Falilou Sarr(African Center for Global Peace and Development, Senegal)□

Wolfgang

Schlupp-Hauck(Chairman, Friedenswerkstatt Mutlangen, Germany)□

Jürgen

Schneider(Professor, Universität Göttingen, Germany)□ Sukla

Sen(Committee for Communal Amity, India)□

Steven

Starr(Senior Scientist, Physicians for Social Responsibility and Associate, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, USA)□

Kathleen

Sullivan(Program Director, Hibakusha Stories, USA)□

P

K Sundaram(DiaNuke.org, India)□

Nobels, Parliamentarians, NGOs, in appeal on Missile Defence/Nuclear Disarmament

Written by John Hallam

Thursday, 02 February 2012 14:43 - Last Updated Sunday, 08 February 2015 22:25

Terumi

Tanaka(Secretary General, Japan Confederation of A- and H-Bomb Sufferers Organizations, Japan)□

Desmond

Tutu(Nobel Peace Laureate, Archbishop Emeritus of Cape Town, South Africa)□

Hiro

Umebayashi(Special Advisor, Peace Depot, Japan)□

Jo

Vallentine(Chairperson, Anti-Nuclear Alliance of Western Australia, Australia)□

Dirk

Van der Maelen(Member of Parliament, Belgium)□

Achin

Vanaik(University of Delhi, India)□

Alyn

Ware(International Representative, Peace Foundation, New Zealand)□

Elizabeth

Waterston(International Councilor, Medact, UK)□

Rick

Wayman(Director of Programs, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, USA)□

Dave

Webb(Chair, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, UK)□ Tim

Wright(Director, International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Australia)□

Col.

Valery Yarynich(Soviet Missile Forces – ret., Russia)□

Uta

Zapf(Member of the Bundestag, Germany)

Endnotes:

[i]

To date, Spain, Romania, the Netherlands, Poland and the Czech Republic have agreed to participate in this deployment. Patriot missiles have been deployed in Poland on the border of the Russian enclave in Kaliningrad and X-band radar is also likely to be deployed in Turkey. Medium- and intermediate-range interceptor missiles are scheduled to be deployed on U.S. warships in the Mediterranean and Baltic Seas.□ [ii]

Tom Collina, “NATO Set to Back Expanded Missile Defense,” Arms Control Today, retrieved from http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2010_11/NATOMissileDefense .

[iii]

Rusian Pukhov, “Medvedev’s Missile Threats are only his Plan B,”

The Moscow Times, December 1, 2011, retrieved from <http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/medvedevs-missile-threats-are-his-plan-b/448992.html>

.[]

[iv]

Yousaf Butt and Theodore Postol, "Upsetting the Reset: The Technical Basis of Russian Concern over NATO Missile Defense" (2011), FAS Special Report No. 1, Federation of American Scientists, September 2011, retrieved from <http://www.fas.org/pubs/docs/2011%20Missile%20Defense%20Report.pdf> .[]

[v]

U.S. strategic targets include Russian military forces, war supporting and WMD infrastructure, and both military and national leadership. Hans Kristensen, "Obama and the Nuclear War Plan," Federation of the American Scientists Brief, February 2010, retrieved from <http://www.fas.org/programs/ssp/nukes/publications1/WarPlanIssueBrief2010.pdf> .[]

[vi]

The U.S. has successfully tested non-ballistic missiles which have traveled at speeds up to mach-20 (16,700 mph or 27,000 km per hour). See <http://www.examiner.com/military-technology-in-washington-dc/the-usaf-x51-a-and-the-u-s-army-ahw-both-test-november-2011> .[]

[vii]

"Hypersonic missile: who is the target?" Voice of Russia, November 28, 2011, retrieved from <http://english.ruvr.ru/2011/11/28/61168605.html> .[]

[viii]

JDEC was agreed on and ratified by both the U.S. and Russia, with the purpose of preventing accidental nuclear war between them as a result of a false warning of attack. See <http://www.fas.org/nuke/control/jdec/text/000604-warn-wh3.htm>

However, neither side appeared willing to share the "raw" or unfiltered data from their early warning systems because of concerns it would reveal too much to the other side about its warning system capabilities. Thus, the facility was never opened; an empty building in Moscow where the center was supposed to be stands as a testament to the continued failure to cooperate.[]

[ix]

Text of Medvedev's November 23, 2011 speech translated from the Russian version, retrieved from <http://eng.kremlin.ru/transcripts/3115> :[]

First,

I am instructing the Defence Ministry to immediately put the missile attack early warning station in Kaliningrad on combat alert.[]

Second,

protective cover of Russia's strategic nuclear weapons will be reinforced as a priority measure under the programme to develop our air and space defences.[]

Third,

the new strategic missiles commissioned by the Strategic Missile Forces and the Navy will be equipped with advance missile penetration systems and new highly-effective warheads.[] Fourth, I

have instructed the Armed Forces to draw up measures for disabling missile defence system data and guidance systems, if need be.□

These

measures will be adequate, effective, and low-cost.□

Fifth,

if the above measures prove insufficient, the Russian Federation System will employ modern, offensive weapon systems in the west and south of the country, ensuring our ability to take out any part of the missile defence system in Europe.□

One

step in this process will be to deploy Iskander missiles in the Kaliningrad region.□

Other

measures to counter the European missile defence system will be drawn up and implemented as necessary.□

Furthermore,

if the situation continues to develop not to Russia's favor, we reserve the right to discontinue further disarmament and arms control measures.□ Besides, given the intrinsic link between strategic offensive and defensive arms, conditions for the withdrawal from the New START Treaty could also arise, and this option is enshrined in the treaty.□

But

let me stress this point, we are not closing the door on continued dialogue with the USA and NATO on missile defence, and on practical cooperation in this area. We are ready for that. However, this can only be achieved by establishing a clear, legal basis for cooperation that would guarantee our legitimate interests and concerns are taken into account. We are open to dialogue and hope for a reasonable and constructive approach from our Western partners.□

[x]

Missile defense is explicitly discussed in the preamble and in Article 5 of New START. The preamble recognizes the "relationship between strategic offensive arms and strategic defensive arms" and stipulates that "current strategic defensive arms do not undermine the viability and effectiveness of strategic offensive arms of the Parties." Thus, the ongoing deployment of U.S./NATO missile defense systems is, in the eyes of Russia, at least a violation of the spirit of New START.□

[xi]

Ibid.□

[xii]

Steven Starr, "Catastrophic Climatic Consequences of Nuclear Conflict," The International Commission on Nuclear

Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, December 2009, retrieved from <http://www.icnnd.org/Do>

[cuments/Starr Nuclear Winter Oct 09.pdf](#)

.[]

[xiii]

Steven Starr, "U.S .and Russian Launch-Ready Nuclear Weapons: A Threat to All Peoples and Nations," Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, October 2011, retrieved from http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/pdfs/2011_06_24_starr.pdf

.[]

[xiv]

Specific proposals for such assessments have already been published by Foreign Affairs and the Federation of American Scientists. See B. Blair, V. Esin, M. McKinzie, V. Yarynich and P. Zolotarev, "Smaller and Safer: A New Plan for Nuclear Postures," Foreign Affairs, Sept/Oct 2010, Vol. 89, No. 5, p. 10, retrieved from http://carnegieendowment.org/static/npp/pdf/Smaller_and_Safer.pdf

and

Hans

Kristensen, R. Norris, and I. Oelrich, "From Counterforce to Minimal Deterrence: A New Nuclear Policy on the Path Toward Eliminating Nuclear Weapons," Federation of American Scientists & The Natural Resources Defense Council, Occasional Paper, April 2009, p. 15, retrieved from <http://www.fas.org/pubs/docs/OccasionalPaper7.pdf> .[]

[xv]One

Hundred Nuclear Wars: Stable Deterrence between the United States and Russia at Reduced Nuclear Force Levels Off Alert in the Presence of Limited Missile Defenses». Bruce Blair, Victor Esin, Matthew McKinzie, Valery Yarynich, Pavel Zolotarev. Science & Global Security, Volume 19, Issue 3, 2011, pages 167-194.

[xvi]

O. B. Toon and A. Robock, "Local nuclear war, global suffering." Scientific American, 302, 74-81 (2010), retrieved from <http://climate.envsci.rutgers.edu/pdf/RobockToonSciAmJan2010.pdf> . []