

Trident Discussion Mind Map

- INSPIRED BY "The Truth About Trident" by Timmon M. Wallis



The UK nuclear mind-set derives from 1945. Trident is no more of the 'real world' of today than colonialism, slavery or apartheid. Ongoing multilateral disarmament initiatives being boycotted and voted down by UK are supported by the overwhelming majority of countries. We must join the 'real world' of the 21st century.

WW2 experience shows that mass destruction of cities does not win wars. Allied refusal to negotiate surrender terms with Japan was prolonging the war. Soviet invasion probably prompted surrender to US.

This ignores role of UN and changing face of Europe. Soviets did not invade non-aligned neighbours and actually had no intention to invade Western Europe. Meanwhile some nuclear armed countries were defeated in wars. 16 nuclear war 'near misses' - a very unsafe time

What from?
- not terrorism, rogue states, cyber warfare or human tragedies. Nuclear weapons are **no** help in Iraq, Syria, Libya, Ukraine etc.

Trident designed in '70s for Cold War that ended in '90s. N5 exceptionalism causes permanent risk of proliferation.

Nuclear weapons cannot meet Just War criteria. *Ad bellum* they fail on: proportionality and probability of success. *In bellum* they fail on: distinction (inherently indiscriminate, proportionality and inhumane consequences. All the attempts at moral justification depend on intention to use, i.e. a commitment to mass murder, unimaginable suffering and putting all life at risk. To resolve nuclear ethics for yourself against personal moral criteria see: <http://nuclearmorality.com>

Electoral evidence suggests the opposite: Labour won in 1964 with a mandate to disarm but failed to do so. Labour lost in 1983 after split with SDP which also opposed Trident. And in 2015 by losses to SNP and other anti-nuclear parties.

Nuclear weapons can be abolished. They depend on a vast amount of engineering. To monitor and verify elimination is easier than for any other weapon. We employ thousands of professional people just to maintain the technology; we can decide not to do it. Most countries have already done so. A treaty to ban nuclear weapons is a very practical possibility.

In the face of NPT Article VI, UK retains 215 100 kT warheads and presses ahead with Trident renewal, - promotes the CTBT while using simulation technology, - promotes FMCOT but retains ample fissile material, - researches verification but prohibits inspection, and - boycotts multilateral negotiations under UN OEWG.

British nuclear disarmament would be welcomed by nearly all countries. It would put moral pressure on rest of P5 and strengthen anti-nuclear movements in P5 and NATO countries, Moral rejection is an essential step towards abolition.

For detailed consideration of this issue a good starting point is:
The Truth About Trident:- Disarming the Nuclear Argument by Tim Wallis, LUATH Press 2016
ISBN: 978-1-910745-31-1, £12.99 from Quaker Bookshop
<https://www.bookshop.quaker.org>



Not really...US owns the missiles and controls the software. NATO (=US) controls targeting. Firing has to be approved by UK PM

Most NATO countries will not allow nuclear weapons on their territory. Relations with USA (and the world) should not be just nuclear.

No - not for P5 seat at UN, or for G8, G20 or OECD. And UK does have constructive leading roles in many other fora not related to NW. Yes - for 'bad boy' status in NPT.

UK currently on trial for breaching NPT Article VI. And in 1996 the ICJ ruled out use of NW except in the extreme case of defending survival of the state and only if all other laws of war could be met - clearly impossible with current weapons. Humanitarian initiatives will fill the 'legal gap'.

In a system where failures are potentially catastrophic, the record of numerous accidents to submarines, fires, human failures, transport safety lapses and design compromise indicates that by any conventional risk analysis Trident is unsafe.

The cost of saving jobs in this way is probably between £1 million and £10 million each. 20,000 people could be saved from dead-end Trident jobs and redeployed to useful ongoing green engineering projects and some to Trident (and global) nuclear decommissioning.

What else might we do with £4 billion a year over the next 45 years?

What does that say about deterrence, if it requires firepower equivalent to unleashing all that of WW2 in one assault?

Scrapping Trident may yet be a crucial factor in holding UK together.

M. Birdseye & D. Varma

