Our daily tsunami

Each day we pour thousands of people — including New Mexicans — into maintaining a flood of nuclear weapons. When will we stop this folly?

By Greg Mello 1/6/05

The latest is the south Asian tsunami will claim 150,000 or more lives. It is by any measure a terrible disaster.

U.N. and private relief officials say famine, thirst and disease could claim as many lives as the sea if basic needs are not quickly provided. Many nations are pledging aid; President Bush has increased the initial U.S. offer from $15 million to $350 million.

Let us imagine, if we can, a catastrophe of this scale caused by human negligence. It would be a great crime. Unspeaking worse, however, it would be a planned catastrophe. Who could contemplate creating such a catastrophe or put the machinery in place to make it happen?

Actually, thousands of people in the United States do so every day. These are the men and women who lead and work in the government's nuclear weapons industry, including several thousand in New Mexico. Their job is to produce the threat of great danger to others through awesome weapons.

It has been done already. On Aug. 6, 1945, an atomic bomb with an explosive yield of 15 kilotons of TNT was dropped on Hiroshima, Japan. Before Japanese authorities could digest this event, a second, 20-kiloton bomb was detonated above Nagasaki on Aug. 9. By the end of that year, 210,000 people had died from these two explosions; roughly another 90,000 prematurely died as a result of these bombs since then.

Those deaths were fully premeditated. Even before a full-scale test was conducted in July of that year in New Mexico, there was little practical uncertainty about the blast, heat and radiation effects of these bombs. What uncertainty might have remained was thoroughly dispelled by the Trinity test near Alamogordo.

Like the invasion of Iraq, which has also caused civilian casualties comparable to this week's tsunami, the atomic bombing of Japan was a clear crime under existing law. So let's call a spade a damn shovel. Our two nuclear labs, Los Alamos and Sandia National laboratories, are the world's foremost facilities for the production of mass death on demand.

Their weapons are like portable death camps; instead of laboriously bringing victims to gas chambers and ovens, the ovens can be brought to the victims in a matter of minutes — once all the preliminary work is done by so many willing hands. These labs help provide our rulers a way to inflict on as many others as possible the most extreme opposite of what we would like others to do to us — the most extreme opposite of the Golden Rule.

Evangelicals, take note: This arguably makes nuclear weapons the central exemplar and metaphor for all that is upside down in our scale of values today. If it's OK to threaten complete annihilation for millions, surely far lesser forms of violence, both overt and structural, also are justified.

Over the past 60 years, our country has spent $7 trillion of its citizens' labor and money to generate 70,000 nuclear warheads at an average cost of about $100 million apiece. We retain 10,400 such weapons today in our nuclear arsenal.

The $35 million promised in initially in relief for hard-hit Asian nations represents about one-third of what it historically has cost us for a single nuclear weapon — the casualties from which would likely exceed those from this week's tsunami.

Morbidity, and even law, are somewhat out of fashion in the hallowed halls of the national security state, and so we ask only this: Which of what follows is the better national security investment?

This year, Los Alamos Lab will spend about $200 million to produce plutonium bomb cores ("pits"). After spending about $1.7 billion over a decade-long period, the lab hopes to start manufacturing pits in earnest in 2007 in order to augment the 23,000 pits the U.S. already has. If the lab slowed down these grotesque efforts to build that 23,001th pit by just 20 percent for just one year we could double our aid to the hundreds of thousands of people who are now in mortal danger. Which is the better security investment?

This year's budget for Los Alamos Lab is more than twice as much as will be spent on all the programs of the World Health Organization for the entire world. And the Iraq war costs more than 100 times as much.

Which is the better security investment, aggressively creating hatred against us while killing and maiming thousands of our own people in an unprecedented invasion of a foreign country? Or providing clean water, child immunization programs and increasing food security all over the world?

It is tragic that any of this has to be asked, and asked in a guest article like this one. It is too obvious.

If newspaper editors could find the courage in their hearts to speak up clearly and reporters to ask obvious but embarrassing questions, we would not be in Iraq, nor would Los Alamos be making plutonium pits.

Hundreds of millions of dollars in U.S. aid would be flowing to these stricken countries, and you and I need not cry out in shame for what our country has become.

Where will those editors find the courage to speak for basic human values? Dear reader, from our own, from our own.
Speaker to take up Lenin's question

The Los Alamos Study Group will host a discussion with David Barsamian, founder of the respected Alternative Radio network at 7 p.m. on Thursday at Cloud Cliff Bakery, 1805 Second St. Barsamian will take up Lenin's famous question, "What Is To Be Done?" in the context of the crisis of democracy in the United States today.

The doors open at 6:30 p.m. and there is a suggested donation of $5.
Speaker critiques media, Bush
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David Barsamian said all capital in America is going to the war machine.

"All the money is going to weapons of death," Barsamian said, speaking to a crowd of more than 100 at the SUB on Monday.

Barsamian is the founder and director of Alternative Radio, an independent weekly radio show in Boulder, Colo.

Claire Long, one of the organizers of the event, said the College Greens expected about 100 people to show up.

Around 6:45 p.m. all 100 seats were already full.

"And liberals never show up on time," she said.

The event started at 7 p.m. They added seats to accommodate extra people.

Barsamian said in New Mexico, one in four people do not have health care, though the state puts a lot of money into creating weapons.

He said citizens who are aware have a responsibility to do something about the way things are in America.

"To look away, for a conscious citizen, is unacceptable," he said.

Barsamian said individuals complain they are only one person and don't feel they can make a difference.
"Gandhi was one person," he said, "Martin Luther King was one person and they made tremendous change."

He added that looking away is a courageous act. Persistence, he said, is what will change the political situation in the United States.

He said Bush and his administration are using the same scare tactics they used to convince Americans to fight the war in Iraq to convince Americans to privatize Social Security.

Barsamian said Social Security is the greatest program in American history for reducing poverty, and right-wingers want to get rid of it.

He also said corporate media is a sounding board for the Bush administration.

"If your diet is corporate media, you are going to be in the dark," Barsamian said.

Most people's diet consists of corporate media, he said, and mainstream media does not serve the public interests.

Decoding propaganda does not take any special training, Barsamian said. It just takes analytical skills.

Long wanted Barsamian to speak at UNM, because he is one of the leading voices in alternative radio, she said.

Alternative radio is a good venue for progressives to be heard, Long said.

UNM student Chris Sanderson said Barsamian reiterated viewpoints he holds about the political situation in America, but it was good to see someone who was "like-minded."

Barsamian ended his hour-and-45-minute speech by saying they were only his opening remarks.
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The Pentagon has tasked the U.S. Strategic Command with a tough and critical new mission: spearheading the Defense Department's efforts to combat weapons of mass destruction.

According to Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, StratCom will:

- Synchronize all military means of dealing with weapons of mass destruction.
- Assess what the military must do to "dissuade, deter and prevent" a nation or group from acquiring or using WMD and their technology.

The assignment handed down last month by Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld further enhances the key strategy-making role the command, headquartered at Offutt Air Force Base near Bellevue, already is playing in the battle against terrorism around the globe.

President Bush has called weapons of mass destruction - or WMD - in the hands of terrorists or hostile states one of the greatest security challenges the United States faces in the post-9/11 world.

StratCom becomes the "single DoD focal point to integrate and synchronize" all military means of dealing with weapons of mass destruction, according to a Rumsfeld memo, a copy of which was obtained by The World-Herald.

The memo says StratCom will assess what the military needs and must do to "dissuade, deter and prevent the acquisition, development, transfer or use of WMD, their delivery systems and associated technology and materials."
"This is a very significant new responsibility for StratCom," said U.S. Sen. Chuck Hagel, R-Neb., who was briefed recently at StratCom on the new mission. "It's another piece in the very sweeping arc of global responsibilities that StratCom has."

An analyst for a strategic defense think tank in Washington, D.C., said StratCom's new assignment could put some much-needed planning emphasis on combating weapons of mass destruction.

Despite all the talk about the threat, it's an area that has not gotten sufficient attention, focus and resources, said Victoria Samson of the Center for Defense Information.

"There are pressing threats out there," Samson said. "There's a need to focus on WMD proliferation immediately."

Navy Capt. Jamie Graybeal, a StratCom spokesman, confirmed the new mission.

At this point, it's too early to say whether the new mission will require an expansion of manpower at StratCom, he said.

Marine Corps. Gen. James Cartwright, StratCom's top leader, is just beginning to decide how to organize the command to accomplish the new mission. And the new assignment comes as the command is already in the midst of a reorganization in which some jobs will be moved out to new sub-commands in Washington, D.C., and Colorado Springs, Colo.

"To talk about what the future organization or structure would be is purely speculative at this point," Graybeal said.

As deadly as the attacks in New York and Washington were on 9/11, analysts have warned of an even worse scenario: terrorists' use of chemical, biological, nuclear or radiological weapons to inflict a massive death toll and panic.

The belief that deposed Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein once possessed WMD became a key reason for the U.S. invasion of Iraq. No such weapons were found, and U.S. officials have since concluded that Iraq no longer possessed them at the time of the invasion.

InsideDefense.com, an online news service that covers defense issues, said Rumsfeld wants to shore up weaknesses in the military's approach to weapons of mass destruction that were revealed in Iraq.

The job of defending the nation against such threats cuts across a number of U.S. government agencies, including the Departments of Homeland Security, Justice and Defense.

Until now, no defense agency outside Rumsfeld's office has taken a lead role within the U.S. military to plan and coordinate efforts for combating WMD.
That job is now StratCom’s. Rumsfeld’s memo asks all combat commands around the world, military departments and Defense Department agencies to support StratCom "to develop an integrated and comprehensive approach to counter the WMD threat."

Given the gravity of the threat, U.S. Sen. Ben Nelson said, StratCom’s new mission further "puts our community on the front lines in support of the war on terror."

Defense analysts say the new mission seems to be a good fit for the new StratCom that has emerged since 9/11.

While its strategic planning previously was limited to the nation’s nuclear arsenal, StratCom has been assigned by Bush to lead Defense Department efforts in space, global strike, network warfare, intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, communications and missile defense.

But as the U.S. experience in Iraq showed, the job will be a difficult one, said Samson of the Center for Defense Information. "We don't have a very good grasp of exactly what the threat is," she said. "They have their work cut out for them."

She said it may take years before StratCom's assessments lead to an actual operational military doctrine and plan.

Greg Mello of the Los Alamos Study Group, a think tank opposed to nuclear proliferation, wonders whether StratCom has been handed an impossible task. Weapons of mass destruction are a difficult thing to get at militarily, no matter the means of attack, he said, because they have no signature and are easy to disperse and hide.

While the Bush administration often looks to military options, Mello said, the best way to deal with the threat is diplomatically, by use of cooperative security agreements, economic incentives and disincentives, ground inspections and the rule of law.
Bush budget would mean more for LANL, less for Sandia

DIANA HEIL | The New Mexican
February 8, 2005

The Bush Administration dished out a few surprises for the Energy Department with its Monday budget proposal.

"While there are some positive elements to this budget proposal, overall New Mexico's labs don't fare as well as I would like them to," U.S. Sen. Jeff Bingaman, D-N.M., said in a news release.

If Congress goes along with it, spending for the Energy Department would fall 2 percent to $23.4 billion.

New Mexico would see a $6 million decrease over current funding, which is at $4.5 billion.

"It's possible, even likely, that the nuclear-weapons budget may decline for the first time since 1995 in projected constant-dollar terms," according to Greg Mello of the Los Alamos Study Group in Albuquerque.

But Mello and other anti-nuke activists aren't celebrating.

The proposed budget is streaked with "misplaced priorities," according to Jay Coghlant of Nuclear Watch New Mexico, a watchdog group in Santa Fe.

Back on the table are four controversial nuclear weapons programs that Congress last year either completely cut, substantially reduced or redirected, Coghlant said. Of the increased funding, $4 million, would go toward studying "bunker busters," a new weapon that could destroy hardened, deeply buried targets.

Meanwhile, a program to stop the spread of nuclear materials throughout the world got a 15 percent increase, to $1.6 billion, a boost both senators Bingaman and Pete Domenici, R-N.M., praised.

New Mexico workers, however, may wonder what the 2006 budget proposal means for them. Some programs in the state would swell while others would shrink.

Los Alamos National Laboratory stands to gain more: $1.8 billion, up $29 million over this year.

Funding at Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque would decrease to $1.381 billion. That's $121 million below what it got this year, according to Domenici.
"It's too early to speculate on what it would mean," Sandia spokesman John German said, noting that the proposed budget has a long road ahead through Congress.

The Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in Carlsbad also would take a hit. The budget proposal includes

$226 million for WIPP, down

$11.5 million from this year, according to Domenici.

WIPP, which accepted its first radioactive shipment in March 1999, is designed to permanently store plutonium-contaminated waste more than 2,100 feet underground in ancient salt beds.

Within the LANL budget is money for programs to stop the spread of nuclear materials in the world, make plutonium triggers for nuclear weapons, build the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Facility, upgrade the power infrastructure and accelerate cleanup of contamination on lab grounds.

There's also $27 million for the controversial and vastly over-budget Dual Axis Radiographic Hydrodynamic Test facility, an X-ray machine intended to produce three-dimensional images of materials during an explosion.

"Accelerated" waste cleanup at Los Alamos would receive $142 million, up $23 million from this year. The state is prepared to sign a massive environmental cleanup order with the Energy Department and Los Alamos lab. But Ron Curry, the New Mexico environment secretary, said he isn't sure what the budget means by accelerated cleanup and he plans to talk to lab Director Pete Nanos about it.

"There's a possibility that the funding the Department of Energy needs to push forward on this order could be cut," Curry said in an interview Monday.
EDITORIAL

Shake-ups needed in workings of DOE

This week the new U.S. secretary of state, Condoleezza Rice — during her mission to Europe to repair strained relations with U.S. allies — wagged her diplomatic finger at Iran and warned it about pursuing its nuclear weapons ambitions. Her warning is understandable. The last thing the world needs is another nuclear power, whether it’s Iran or Cuba. But to those who monitor U.S. nuclear weapons policy and its many contradictions, Rice’s warning also is questionable in that it once again tells the world to do as we say, not as we do.

Rice’s posturing might carry some weight internationally, as well as here at home, if it were not undermined by revelations this week about the administration’s proposed Department of Energy budget. The proposal again would ramp up DOE’s nuclear weapons efforts, by about $480 million, even while it plans to cut DOE’s environmental-remediation budget by about $780 million, with the aim of cleaning up the still heavily contaminated and increasingly dangerous nuclear weapons complex from its negligent Cold War ways.

The budget is a double-edged sword for states such as New Mexico, where two of the nation’s three nuclear weapons labs—Los Alamos and Sandia—are located and are vital to local economic prosperity. It also is where some federal and state officials seek to undermine the state’s appropriately tough environmental regulation — including stiff noncompliance fines — of these DOE facilities.

The proposed 2006 DOE budget would have the United States pursuing both new weapons designs (a nuclear warhead penetrator, for example) and a potential shake-up of its fundamental nuclear weapons design philosophy, aimed at offsetting an aging nuclear weapons arsenal by possibly replacing rather than maintaining it.

Hundreds of billions of dollars have been spent building and maintaining that arsenal, so you can imagine the economic, policy and diplomatic implications of such a radical approach.

DOE’s priorities do not make sense in a world in which the nuclear threat is less from nations than from terrorists and in which the United States must lead by edict but by example. The United States’ emphasis should be on containing, not expanding, nuclear weaponry — essentially supporting all aspects of nonproliferation, including in its own arsenal. Because the White House shows no interest in reordering DOE and its labs to reflect real-world threats, Congress should do the job itself.

First, the DOE is not a sacred cow. Because the White House continues its fiscal irresponsibility, Congress must cut the DOE budget proportionately — including the too-long-protected nuclear weapons program, in which recent spending equals or outpaces spending during the peak Cold War years.

If that means reductions in the budgets at Sandia and Los Alamos, then so be it. New Mexico has sacrificed in the past in the national interest, and it can do so again.

Experts differ, but it appears that such cuts can be made without any immediate impact on the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile, which appears to be robust for the immediate future. True, the stockpile is aging, and that needs to be addressed over time and in time to ensure that it remains reliable, safe and secure for the foreseeable future. Some believe that can be done for far less than currently is being spent.

Second, over the past decade, billions of U.S. tax dollars have been spent on technologies aimed at maintaining that stockpile without more testing of nuclear weapons. The return on that investment, particularly in wasteful programs such as the National Ignition Facility laser at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, has been less than obvious.

Congress should explore other options, including further reductions in the size of the arsenal and remanufacturing of components to ensure reliability of existing designs.

Finally, U.S. nuclear weapons policy is far too important to be left to bureaucrats, laboratories, scientists and military officers who have built-in conflicts. Their views are essential. But Americans, who deliberately have been kept out of the nuclear loop, are entitled to have an extensive, open and transparent nuclear weapons policy debate.

As long as nuclear weapons exist as a military option, the United States must have an arsenal sufficient to deter aggressors. But Americans, as a democratic people, should determine what direction they want their nuclear arsenal, their nuclear laboratories and their nuclear forces to go.
WIPP shipments from Los Alamos to resume

Associated Press
February 15, 2005

LOS ALAMOS, N.M. (AP) - Los Alamos National Laboratory says it won't be able to finish moving its highest-risk radioactive waste from its dump and storage site to a Carlsbad repository until October at the earliest.

The nuclear weapons laboratory missed a December deadline for shipping that waste to the federal government's Waste Isolation Pilot Plant.

An audit report released by the lab Monday blamed a work shutdown in July and problems following U.S. Department of Energy procedures for the missed deadline, but said the DOE's failure to provide critical resources contributed.

Lab operations shut down in July after two computer disks believed to contain classified information were reported missing and an intern suffered an eye injury from a laser. Operations were gradually restarted during the following months.

The lab took much of the blame for falling nearly two years behind schedule in shipping waste left from years of weapons work. The audit by the DOE's Office of the Inspector General said the lab "did not adhere to waste certification requirements."

But the audit also said the DOE never delivered two mobile waste processing units the lab expected to use to sort about 19,000 drums of waste.

The shutdown and failure to follow procedures cost the DOE about $23 million, the audit said.

In the five years before 2003, the lab shipped about 1,600 drums to WIPP.

The audit blamed the lab's attempt to increase the shipping rate for part of the program's woes.

"When Los Alamos attempted to increase shipping rates to 2,000 drums in a single year, operating procedures failed," it said.

The audit said the lab might not finish removing waste from decades of weapons work before 2014, four years after the DOE originally pledged to complete shipments from the lab. The project will be more than $70 million above the projected costs.
Greg Mello, director of the watchdog Los Alamos Study Group, said the waste is dangerous.

"It sits in tents and some of the drums contain proliferation-sensitive quantities of waste," he said. "It is safer at WIPP than where it is."

Lab officials said they are working with the DOE to get shipments restarted by April to WIPP, which buries plutonium-contaminated waste 2,150 feet below ground in ancient salt beds.

The lab stopped shipping waste in October 2003 after federal officials discovered 98 drums had not been properly certified for disposal in WIPP. The waste largely consists of such things as gloves, tools, clothing and radioactive sludge.

Sorting the waste resumed last summer, but was halted again by Los Alamos' shutdown.

Kathy DeLucas, a lab spokeswoman, said Los Alamos is working with the DOE's National Nuclear Security Administration to implement proper procedures and resume waste shipments.

The Los Alamos lab has produced about 40,000 drums of waste over about 60 years and has spent more than $350 million to sort, certify and dispose of it since 1997.

The Bush administration proposed increasing WIPP's operating budget next year, despite the DOE's failure to meet waste disposal goals.

WIPP critic Don Hancock, director of the nuclear safety project for the Southwest Research and Information Center in Albuquerque, said WIPP is being rewarded for not producing.

Last year, the DOE told Congress it planned 1,700 shipments to WIPP. It sent 966.

For fiscal 2006, the DOE cut its shipping goal to 1,300 shipments and is asking for a 12 percent increase in WIPP's operating budget to $188 million.

Ines Triay, acting manager of WIPP for DOE, said the higher budget would allow the shipment rate to rise to meet the new target. Shipments come from DOE facilities around the nation.
Los Alamos National Laboratory missed a December deadline for shipping its highest-risk radioactive waste to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant, near Carlsbad.

New projections are that LANL won't finish removing high-risk transuranic waste from its Area G radioactive dump and storage site until October "at the earliest," according to a report released on Monday.

LANL officials say they are working with DOE to get shipments restarted by April.

The lab's work shutdown in July and problems following the Energy Department's procedures are the main factors in the delay, but DOE's failure to provide critical resources also contributed, according to the review.

In the audit from DOE's Office of the Inspector General, LANL also takes much of the blame for falling more than two years behind schedule in its shipments of historic transuranic waste to WIPP.

"The (Energy) Department will not meet its transuranic waste disposal commitments because Los Alamos did not adhere to waste certification requirements," according to the audit.

But the review also notes that DOE never delivered two mobile waste processing units that LANL expected to sort about 19,000 drums of waste.

The audit predicts LANL may not complete its removal of legacy transuranic waste before 2014—four years after DOE originally committed to completing shipments from LANL, and more than $70 million beyond projected costs.

"This waste is dangerous," said Los Alamos Study Group director and laboratory watchdog Greg Mello. "It sits in tents and some of the drums contain proliferation-sensitive quantities of waste. It is safer at WIPP than where it is."

LANL's shipments of transuranic waste—clothing, tools and sludges contaminated with manmade radioactive elements such as plutonium—came to a stop in October 2003 when federal officials found that 98 waste drums were not properly certified for disposal.

Waste sorting resumed in July 2004, but was halted weeks later without any shipments when LANL director Pete Nanos stopped work across the lab to review safety and security procedures.
The shutdown and LANL's failure to follow procedures cost DOE about $23 million, according to the audit.

LANL spokeswoman Kathy DeLucas said the weapons laboratory is working closely with DOE's National Nuclear Security Administration in Los Alamos and at the WIPP site near Carlsbad to implement proper procedures and resume waste shipments.

"With their support we will resume shipping in April and get the waste off the hill as quickly as we can while paying close attention to the issues identified in the report," she said.

The audit, in fact, blames haste for much of LANL's waste woes.

In the five years prior to 2003, LANL shipped about 1,600 drums to WIPP.

"When Los Alamos attempted to increase shipping rates to 2,000 drums in a single year, operating procedures failed," the audit noted.

As of January, DOE's waste shipping schedule anticipated LANL would be able to make five shipments to WIPP as soon as March. The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, an independent group that reviews Energy Department nuclear safety issues, anticipates LANL can resume shipping by May, but DeLucas said LANL officials believe April is realistic.

"We are very confident about that," she said.

In all, LANL has produced about 40,000 drums of legacy transuranic waste over the last six decades and since 1997 DOE has spent more than $350 million to sort, certify and dispose of it.
Subject: BASIC Press Release - What is going on at the US nuclear weapons laboratories?
From: "Nigel Chamberlain" <nchamberlain@basicint.org>
Date: Thu, 10 Mar 2005 12:18:37 -0000
To: <nchamberlain@basicint.org>

Apologies for the late notification, but Greg Mello is keen to talk to MPs if a small meeting might be arranged on Monday evening or Tuesday morning. Please get back to me if you have the time and the inclination.

Regards
Nigel Chamberlain

Press Release from the British American Security Information Council
Thursday 10 March 2005

What is going on at the US nuclear weapons laboratories in New Mexico and California
and what might UK scientists from Aldermaston have been doing on their recent visit?

Greg Mello, Director of the Los Alamos Study Group, will be in London this weekend and until Tuesday evening to answer these questions and raise awareness about the Bush Administration plans for new nuclear warheads and a possible resumption of underground testing in the Nevada desert.

Mr Mello lives and works in New Mexico, where the world’s two best-funded nuclear weapons facilities (Los Alamos and Sandia laboratories) are to be found. A former engineer, for the past decade he has directed the Los Alamos Study Group, a nongovernmental organization devoted to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

Mr. Mello’s trip to London and Brussels stems from his view that American nuclear policy needs a closer review by leaders in other democracies. “You can’t understand what’s going on in U.S. nuclear policy by reading the U.S. newspapers, or even by following the debates in Congress. On the one hand, U.S. nuclear policies are substantially driven by institutional factors which are poorly understood in the capital, and on the other, they are expressions of military imperatives which are seldom if ever openly discussed in those places,” said Mello.

“As a result, there is a widespread, serious misapprehension that identifies Bush Administration rhetoric and programs with some kind of dramatic change in U.S. nuclear policy. There has been no such change, only a gradual intensification of programs and imperatives already in place and at work.”

Mello believes that these widespread misunderstandings about the nature of U.S. nuclear weapons programs and institutions, together with the failure of U.S. liberals to confront the contradictions inherent in nuclear deterrence, has led to an absence of vigorous and effective debate. The result, Mello argues, is that the American neo-conservative agenda, which is completely simpatico with the needs and views of the nuclear weapons bureaucracy, has come to dominate U.S. nuclear policy, with devastating consequences for diplomacy.

In hopes of building greater understanding of U.S. nuclear complex and its imperatives, Mello will be offering a kind of “virtual tour” of the major U.S. nuclear facilities together with a review of their programs and initiatives.

Mr. Mello is traveling with his wife Trish, the operations director of the Study Group. Another aspect of their trip is the interviews they hope to conduct with civic leaders, MEPs, and NGOs on camera, as part of a project to bring back to America the questions and expressions of concern being voiced elsewhere. "The impetus for change must come from those leaders who understand the issues and yet are not required to maintain silence about them for political and bureaucratic reasons," Mello said.
Meeting to help nuke workers file claims

The U.S. Department of Labor will hold town hall meetings in Santa Fe and Española to help nuclear-weapons workers file compensation claims for health problems.

A new part of a federal compensation program gives money and medical benefits to workers, or their survivors, who became ill from exposure to toxic substances at U.S. Department of Energy facilities such as Los Alamos National Laboratory.

The meeting schedule:

• 2 p.m. and 6 p.m. March 23, Northern New Mexico Community College, 921 Paseo de Oñate, Española.

• 6 p.m. March 24, Radisson, 720 N. St. Francis Drive, Santa Fe

To get help filling out claim forms, schedule an appointment after the town hall meeting or call toll-free at (866) 272-3622.

Advisory task force to discuss K-8 schools

The Santa Fe Public Schools K-8 Advisory Task Force will hold an informational meeting from 6 to 8 p.m. Wednesday to discuss what's happening nationally and on the state level with kindergarten-through-eighth-grade schools.

The district recently completed a survey of parents regarding K-8 schools and results from the survey will be shared at the meeting. Refreshments will be served. For more information, call 467-2008.

Groups will discuss military atoms, war, peace

Nuclear weapons and nuclear power plants are two different things. But the Los Alamos Study Group, an anti-nuke group based in Albuquerque, and the University of New Mexico Campus Greens aim to get people thinking: Can the peaceful and the military atoms be separated? Can governments ensure the security of nuclear power plants?

The groups will discuss such questions at Santa Fe's Cloud Cliff Bakery, 1805 2nd St., 7 to 9 p.m. on March 29.

The panel discussion features energy activist David Bacon, Los Alamos Study
In brief: 03/14/2005

Group director Greg Mello and the Citizens Nuclear Information Center of Hobbs.

Comments

By Greg Miller (Submitted: 03/14/2005 8:52 am)

Santa Fe is filled with girly men who will take the credit from real fighters. Not that I'm a green or anti nuke. We probably could use more nuclear power plants. It's always good to see someone stick their neck out and win.

By John Coventry (Submitted: 03/14/2005 8:19 am)

It is too easy.

The Los Alamos Study and the Greens. Eggless burito with a meatless side ... No huevos and Mello Bacon.

There is a local fellow named Doug Doran who has collected 4,500 signatures on a petition to have Los Alamos obey by the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty. With pauper statis, he singlehandedly got the Federal Courts to look at this issues. Now the Green Doctors of Mello Bacon want to take credit for this local activist hard work. What freakin' wimps. Sans huevos and "where's the beef?"
THE GREENS/EFA IN THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT
PRESS RELEASE – Brussels, 16 March 2005

Jean Lambert MEP

Expert calls for citizens inspections:

**More focus on nuclear weapons sites needed**

Nuclear non-proliferation expert Greg Mello today called on MEPs to take more interest in nuclear weapons sites in both the US and EU in order to tackle the lack of accountability and security at these sites and to challenge the dangerous direction of American nuclear policy.

Speaking at a lunchtime briefing in the European Parliament on 'the reality of the U.S. situation – the nuclear build-up in pictures and tables', Mello, who is the Director of the Los Alamos Study Group, called for Europeans to undertake their own fact-finding missions to America to shed light on nuclear programs – and help roll them back. Mello said:

"It is important that EU leaders become more involved in US nuclear weapons policy decisions which are hurting efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation. The direction of US policy is quite dangerous, and the state of debate in America is utterly incapable of restraining these dangers. American nuclear policy needs a closer review by leaders in other democracies."

"We can not promote compliance with the nuclear non-proliferation treaty (NPT) while we break it everyday by retaining huge stockpiles of weapons and working to make these weapons more visible militarily. The extent to which this is going on is something US diplomats do not talk or even know about and it affects all of us. The difficult negotiations with Iran are not helped by continued US violations of the NPT and the recent tendency of the US to denigrate multinational efforts in favour of unilateral expressions of power."

UK Green MEP Jean Lambert, who chaired the briefing, said:

"Given the terrible state of the US nuclear weapons programme, its extent and its continuation, the EU needs to learn from citizen's inspections – not least because there are US nuclear weapons situated in Europe. I was very interested by the discussions among MEPs about the NPT in the last plenary session in Strasbourg, and how horrified people were that nuclear development was going on outside the EU. Yet, we are not facing up to the realities within Europe; we are just burying our heads in the sand. We are now at the point where citizens must make a choice about spending millions of euros and dollars on spurious security measures."

[ENDS]

For more information contact the office of Jean Lambert MEP:
From Jean Lambert MEP

Invitation

To an Expert Seminar Lunch Time Briefing with Greg Mello

'The reality of the U.S. situation - the nuclear build-up in pictures and tables.'

Date: 16 March 2005
Time: 12:30 - 14:00
Room: PHS 1 C 47

You are cordially invited to meet with Greg Mello from Citizen's Inspections of Los Alamos to discuss the realities of U.S. nuclear proliferation.

Background: Recent developments in governance in general in the United States as well as developments specifically in nuclear policy have contributed to a reduction in public scrutiny. This is despite the fact that within the last decade some plutonium which should have been stored has not been fully accounted for. While there is heightened concern about proliferation and local safety, it has proven difficult to convince those in power to continue preventing this type of activity. Mello's Group has been successful in the recent past in postponing plutonium pit production. Nevertheless, in the post 9/11 climate, academics, newspaper editors and publishers are reluctant to be too critical on this issue.

Thoughtful attention to the U.S. situation from MEPs would make a tremendous difference. Greg Mello will present his findings of the "citizen's inspection" of nuclear facilities in Los Alamos to MEPs, bringing slides and briefing materials - in effect bringing the inspection to the Parliament.

A lunch sandwich buffet will be served!

Please RSVP

For further information contact the Office of Jean Lambert
jelambert@europarl.eu.int
The Los Alamos Study Group and Campus Greens are sponsoring a panel discussion, "The Sleep of Reason: Atoms for Peace and War," at 7 p.m. Tuesday at Cloud Cliff Bakery, 1805 Second St.

Panelists include energy activist and former Green Party candidate David Bacon, study group director Greg Mello and special guest Rose Gardner of Citizens Nuclear Information Center of Hobbs.

The event is free and open to the public. For information, contact the study group at (505) 265-1200 or www.lasg.org.
Arm-control proponent crusades in the shadows of N.M. labs

BY JOHN FLECK
Journal Staff Writer

From the bustling living room of a University of New Mexico-area home, Greg Mello is running an international arms-control crusade.

There is nothing modest about Mello's agenda — the dismantlement of the U.S. nuclear arsenal and the apparatus of laboratories and factories that go with it.

"We don't want people to work on these weapons at all," said Mello, head of the tiny Los Alamos Study Group.

Mello traveled earlier this month to London and Brussels, Belgium, to speak to European arms-control activists and members of the European Parliament.

In New Mexico, home to Los Alamos and Sandia national laboratories, nuclear weapons design and maintenance is frequently taken for granted, according to Mello. Not so elsewhere.

"There's a lot of people in the world that are scared spitless about what is happening in New Mexico," Mello said in a recent interview.

Mello is part of a small community of locally based arms-control activists working in the communities around U.S. nuclear weapons laboratories and factories.

His work has made him at times unpopular at the nuclear weapons labs. But it has also won him the respect of some on the opposite side of the fence.

"Greg is a conscientious and intelligent analyst," said Joe Martz, deputy director of Los Alamos National Laboratory's nuclear weapons design division. "I have respected his opinions and learned from him over the years."

Mello's concerns with nuclear weapons are twofold. The first is the obvious — the threat caused by the weapons themselves. But he also believes the work — designing, building and maintaining nuclear weapons — and the institutions responsible for it are morally corrosive.

He admits that belief makes his relationships with those within the nuclear weapons complex difficult. "We just have to disagree about that," he said.

The 55-year-old Mello grew up in California. He was working as a hydrologist for a consulting firm in Santa Fe in the early 1990s when he decided to refocus his life on nuclear weapons issues.

"I was paid well. I was bored," he said of his previous career.

Mello makes $40,000 a year as head of the nonprofit organization. He said nuclear weapons advocates at the labs and in the U.S. government are far more numerous and far better paid than the tiny cadre of anti-nuclear activists of which he is a part.

"We're out-funded by 100,000 to one," he said.

Mello believes the U.S. public in general is uncomfortable with nuclear weapons. He notes a poll conducted by the University of Maryland's Program on International Policy Attitudes last year that concluded a significant majority of people in the United States favor the eventual elimination of all U.S. nuclear weapons.

In Mello's view, the problem is that there is little public discussion of U.S. nuclear weapons policy, something his organization is trying to change.

"We have to have public discussion, and having public discussion takes a lot of work," Mello said. "In the final analysis there's no shortcuts to democracy."
Santa Fe City Councilor Miguel Chavez's proposed resolution, which asks the United States to halt nuclear-weapons production, looks like a slam dunk.

All five councilors on the Public Works Committee endorsed the latest version of the resolution Tuesday. It has yet to be set for a public hearing before the eight-member City Council.

Several years ago, Doug Doran of Santa Fe began collecting signatures on a petition asking for an end to weapons production at Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque. He said the United States already had pledged to stop manufacturing nuclear weapons in a treaty ratified in 1970.

Earlier this year, Chavez introduced the resolution at Doran's request. The Los Alamos Study Group has helped Chavez amend it so it also applies to Los Alamos National Laboratory.

Among those endorsing the resolution Tuesday were Los Alamos Study Group members Greg Mello, Lidia Clark and Willem Malten. Mellow said the resolution is "mainstream" because 84 percent of Americans in a recent poll supported nuclear disarmament.

So far, only Councilor David Pfeffer has opposed the resolution, arguing it is outside the council's purview.

Councilors on the committee responded to Pfeffer's criticism Tuesday. Pfeffer doesn't serve on the committee and wasn't at the meeting.

Councilor Patti Bushee noted the resolution also seeks to stop the disposal of nuclear waste in Northern New Mexico. "That is more than in our back yard," she said. "That is potentially in our water stream. It is absolutely in our purview to make these statements."

Councilor David Coss said President Bush has demanded Iran and North Korea end nuclear-weapons programs. "Somebody once said, 'Get the log out of your eye before you look at the speck in your neighbor's eye,' and I think this resolution says that's just what we ought to do," he said.

Chavez read a letter from the mayor of Hiroshima, Japan, who said he had read the resolution and was "deeply impressed by its clarity and depth."
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Anti-Nuke Resolution Sees Support

John T. Huddy Journal Staff Writer

Move Puts City On Record With Issue

Councilor Miguel Chavez’s proposed resolution to put the Santa Fe City Council on record as opposing new nuclear weapons and calling for the dismantling of existing ones drew nothing but support at its first hearing Tuesday night.

"I think this is well within our purview to discuss," said Councilor David Coss, challenging comments Monday from Councilor David Pfeffer, "particularly when it reads that 40 percent of our nuclear weapons spending happens in New Mexico."

Pfeffer contends councilors should not be discussing issues of national security when they have other local issues, like potholes and annexation, to worry about.

Chavez’s resolution calls for the United States’ compliance with a 1969 treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

"This is more than in our back yard now, it's possibly even in our water streams," Councilor Patti Bushee said, a reference to fears among anti-nuclear activists and others that contaminants from Los Alamos National Laboratory could seep into local waterways.

At Tuesday night’s meeting of the Council’s Public Works Committee, Bushee and Coss both agreed to cosponsor Chavez’s resolution.

Proposals "to upgrade nuclear weapons, design new varieties of such weapons, maintain thousands of nuclear weapons or build new factories for the manufacture of nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons components should be viewed with dismay," the resolution states.

It also calls "immoral" the idea that "human security can ever be built upon instruments of mass destruction and the will to use them."

This is the second Chavez-sponsored anti-nuke resolution since January. His earlier version called for the end of nuclear weapons work at Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque. That resolution was never passed by the council after Chavez pulled it from consideration.

"I think this is a better resolution because it doesn't just target Sandia Labs" and takes a more global position on the nuclear debate, Bushee said.

Greg Mello of the Los Alamos Study Group, an anti-nuclear watchdog group, said during the meeting that Chavez’s resolution "expresses a very mainstream objective." Chavez’s resolution states that "large public opinion polls have shown very strong public support for nuclear disarmament."

Mello also provided a statement earlier in the day saying 117 businesses in Santa Fe support the basic
idea of the resolution. He also said other city councils, including that of Olympia, Wash., have passed similar resolutions and that Chavez's proposal would be used as a model for one to be introduced before the National Conference of Black Mayors.

The resolution would urge New Mexico's congressional delegation and the governor to "call for progressively and systematically dismantling our nuclear weapons in concert with other nuclear powers."

Mello also provided a copy of a letter dated Friday from Tadatoshi Akiba, the mayor of Hiroshima, Japan -- where the first atomic bomb was dropped during World War II -- to Santa Fe Mayor Larry Delgado, calling for support of Chavez's resolution.

The letter notes that Delgado has become a member of the Mayors for Peace -- a collection of national and international city mayors who have voiced support for peace initiatives around the globe.

Akiba commended Delgado for joining the group. "Your support is profoundly meaningful, coming as you do from a part of the world that has struggled so intensely with the issue of nuclear weapons," the letter states.

Akiba also said that the "Hiroshima World Peace Mission will be visiting Santa Fe" April 8 "to meet and learn from people on all sides of the nuclear issue."

"To get that statement from the mayor of Hiroshima really gives credit to the work that we have done," Chavez said Tuesday.

Coss agreed, challenging President Bush on his call for nuclear disarmament in Iran and North Korea, saying: "It's been said that you have to get the log out of your eye before you look at the speck in someone else's eye."

PHOTOS: Color

CHAVEZ: Resolution requests U.S. honor 1969 treaty

PFEFFER: Doesn't think national security issue belongs before council
Anti-Nuke Activist Has 'Tunnel Vision'

YOUR STORY ABOUT ACTIVIST GREG MELLO, who wants to do away with all nuclear weapon and research facilities in New Mexico, was most instructive. It illustrated the tunnel vision that guides many zealots, and the underlying source of their zealotry. ...

Mello (says), "A lot of people ... are scared 'spitless' about what is happening in New Mexico." Oh? Upon just what is their fear focused? On our nuclear accident rate? Zero. On the casualties we've sustained as a result of storing weapons? Zero again. Perhaps fetal deformities from fissile exposure? Another zero. Given that they don't live in New Mexico, what are they afraid of? Do we have just a tiny bit of hyperbole here?

... Most revealing was Mello's comment about why he quit being a hydrologist to run, at a smaller salary, the nonprofit Los Alamos Study Group. He is quoted as having been "bored" in his old job and, precisely there, we have it.

It is my observation and belief that being enthusiastically against something, anything, creates an adrenaline rush similar to that (experienced by) race drivers, parachute jumpers, bungee divers and so on. It is enjoyed for the thrill. So are most demonstrations. The "cause" is really a cover. If forgivable among the young and impressionable, it is less so for the 55-year-old Mello.

I'm sure his motives are clear in his own mind and he knows his "strength is as of the strength of 10" because his heart is pure. But to me it savors of inadequate analysis.

Ed Pennybacker
Albuquerque
Strategic Command to take the lead in coordinating U.S. efforts to combat Weapons of Mass Destruction. This mission will run from the Gemut (more than 1,000 times all the explosives used in military efforts to combat Weapons of Mass Destruction) entering other countries to eliminate their WMD capabilities.

The irony of delegating this new mission to StratCom—an entity which has command of 30,000 U.S. nuclear weapons with a combined explosive yield of about 3.1 gigatons (more than 1,000 times all the explosives used in World War II)—is apparently lost on Rumsfeld and those around him. One would at least think these self-proclaimed pragmatists would understand the political necessity of progressive nuclear disarmament as a necessary ingredient to the success of eliminating other countries' WMD.

The new mission is just the latest to be added to StratCom's portfolio. In October 2002, the 10-year-old StratCom merged with the U.S. Space Command, absorbing many of its functions. A few months later in January 2003, StratCom was assigned the lead role in four new areas: global strike, information operations, strategic missile defense, and global C4ISR—that is, command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance. StratCom is in many ways the epitome of "jointness" in a globalized U.S. military, transcending and integrating the traditional services as well as the five powerful regional commands. StratCom gives the Secretary of Defense and the President a single place to go when some kind of rapid strike is desired—conventional, nuclear, or even in some cases special forces operations. As long-time Pentagon observer Elaine Grossman put in a book called "The Pentagon," "StratCom Commander in Chief General James Cartwright may well emerge as the 'go-to guy' when a president wants to take immediate action."

This active strike role is mirrored in Cartwright's rumored plan to create what one officer said was a smaller, more "nimble" headquarters capable of "rapid decision cycles" during crises. Cartwright plans to divest StratCom of some of its staff functions like intelligence and reconnaissance and move them elsewhere. The overall "integration" of StratCom, the mission that will bring order to the chaos created by so many new missions, is apparently going to be its "space and global strike" function.

But even that's not set in stone. It's important to understand that StratCom is a "work in progress" subject to endless revision and re-direction, and that full development of "prompt global strike" is not technically or organizationally predestined. General Cartwright says he doesn't, right now, have much prompt global capability, and his successors may or may not ever have much more. Other events, we know, might intervene. Empires always fall. Our own is already trembling (we must now import about $2 billion per day to cover the federal deficit). As political analyst Chalmers Johnson reminds us, things which can't continue forever don't.

In the meantime, there are grave dangers in the concentration of command power now being assembled by Secretary Rumsfeld at StratCom. The most conspicuous danger may be the increasingly shorter time needed to execute pre-emptive operations.

---

by Greg Mello, Director, Los Alamos Study Group

The July 2004 appointment of Marine General James "Hoss" Cartwright as StratCom Commander signals the seriousness of Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's intent to broaden StratCom's role in global power projection. The Marines have no nuclear weapons and hence no connection with StratCom's original role. Cartwright's appointment is apparently designed to help Mr. Rumsfeld from its narrow historic role and into active leadership in "prompt global strike" operations.

---
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planned military attacks and the corresponding narrowing of involvement by other military—not to say civilian—authorities. This is the "prompt" in "prompt global strike," and it is already hard-wired in for StratCom's nuclear mission.

In some cases, the authority to launch "prompt" strikes will be pre-delegated, as is the case for nuclear launch now. Quoting Grossman again,

StratCom's new component also would begin developing greater capability to effectively target "something that you needed to hit in minutes rather than hours or days," the [unnamed] officer [familiar with StratCom's mission] said.

In short, the space and global strike component would concentrate its efforts on "those things that you've got to get at very fast, that are in areas where nobody else likely can get very easily," the officer said.

Trip wires in the process would require defense secretary or presidential approval for some of the options, the officer noted. Under certain scenarios—like a rapid North Korean advance across the demilitarized zone or a no-notice Chinese invasion of Taiwan—a limited number of options may be pre-approved for Carterwright's strategic strike, the officer said.

In addition to "pre-approved" war plans, a "menu" of other attack plans are being put on the shelf for rapid execution. Most cases, there will not be time to involve Congress in any sort of constitutionally-mandated deliberation.

"The business of America is doing business, and we do it on a global scale," Carterwright said. That is why the U.S. military has been forced to increasingly take a global approach to the nation's security.

Carterwright, World Herald, March 5, 2005

and vote, or to reach any other kind of democratic consensus. Security and speed also preclude international authority, for example from the U.N. Security Council, unless it too were "pre-delegated."

It thus appears that StratCom, with or without firing a shot, is helping make the anti-democratic and anti-legal potential in high-speed war and space war an established fact. What's the point of being able to communicate at the speed of light or launch a missile which can reach its target in 10 or 30 minutes if Secretary Rumsfeld and General Carterwright have to wait for the slow wheels of democracy and diplomacy to turn? And what if they do not turn in the 'right' way? The limits to this concentration of decisionmaking—if there are any—aren't at all clear.

The second danger is closely related: the classic one of relying more and more on an officer (or "official-corporate") corps at the expense of other forms of national cohesion, internal political strength, and foreign relations. Is everything and everybody destined to wind up as sats because General Carterwright has a closer fork of beams?

Perhaps. According to the U.S. Commission on National Security in the 21st Century, "since the end of the Cold War [and up to 1999], the United States has embarked upon nearly four dozen military interventions... as opposed to only 16 during the entire period of the Cold War." This increase was noted more than a year before the Bush Administration came to power.

At StratCom, it is now a permanent state of war—not peace—that is the shaping and normative vision, with the warriors actively seeking advantages to their own institutions in new realms all the time, even in imagined new U.S. civil wars. As Grossman writes:

Carterwright also is attempting to get the strategic community to think creatively, asking what other "band-aids" beyond space- or cyber-security officials might imagine... He transmits his colleagues to ponder how a "major domestic calamity"—like a "massive WMD [Weapons of Mass Destruction] event, declaration of martial law, for succession of one or more leaders"—might "affect the MO and Strat con."

The third most conspicuous danger may be the increasing level of outright fantasy now found in mainstream U.S. military thought. While not all missions are impossible, the goal of "full spectrum dominance"—the overall objective of U.S. military capability today—is a recipe for failure and defeat. Andrew Bacevich writes, in his important work American Empire: The Realities and Consequences of U.S. Diplomacy:

...Having assessed the security implications of globalization, a process extensively making the world more complicated and more dangerous than ever before—the United States after the Cold War committed itself to establishing a level of military mastery without historical precedent. In magnitude and scope, the dominance to which the Pentagon aspired dwarfed that which American soldiers had imagined was in their grasp a half-century before when in sole possession of the atomic bomb. It is far exceeded that achieved by imperial Rome or by France in the era of Bonaparte. The ambitions of the German general staff in its heyday, including the Schlieffen Plan in 1914 or Operation Barbarossa in 1941 appeared puny by comparison. Staff, unerring, implacable, and unscrupulous, U.S. forces aimed to achieve something approaching omnipotence: "Full Spectrum Dominance."

In remarks reported in the Omaha World-Herald, March 5, 2005, Carterwright himself linked this most aggressive military doctrine explicitly to America's economic interests:

With the increasing globalization of the world's economy, events around the globe can have a real impact on America's daily lives. Carterwright said: "The business of America is doing business, and we do it on a global scale." He said: "Which is why the U.S. military has been forced to increasingly take a global approach to the nation's security."

The problem here, however, is not just defeat—which is inevitable sooner or later—but what men like Rumsfeld, Bush, and Carterwright might do to try to arrest or delay it.

Of course it's happening now. A process of self-defeat is now underway for the American empire, as we lavish our resources and societal attention upon fabulously expensive weapon systems that will not bring security and which squander our physical and moral resources on militarized policies that accomplish, at the very best, nothing good. A recent report from the General Accounting Office found that 70-some-odd major weapon systems under development will have an ultimate combined cost in the neighborhood of $2 trillion. At a military burden currently running at least $5,100 per American household, this is not unsustainable financially and therefore also will not be sustainable politically. How can we bring an end to this collective binge of violence before it consumes us? How far down do we have to go before we start rebuilding our society and ideals?

People in organizations like Nebraskans for Peace have been working on that rebuilding process all along. The darkness of the times and the concurrent crises we now face are creating a new "reachable moment." The best political news I know is that the dawn is much more attractive than the dark.

Greg Kehoe who was the keynote speaker at the February 2004 Annual Peace conference in Grand Island wrote this article expressly for the Nebraska Report.

CARTWRIGHT HEADQUARTERS AT OFFICE AIR FORCE BASE

APRIL 2005 NEBRASKA REPORT, P.3
The Nuclear Disarmament Imperative

by Claire Long and Emily Strabbing, Los Alamos Study Group

Silence in the face of nuclear proliferation communicates support for the illegal, immoral industry of maintaining, researching, creating and deploying nuclear and other weapons.

The growing international spotlight on nuclear proliferation has also activated a worldwide groundswell of voices calling for disarmament. In addition to individuals, hundreds of national and international organizations have formed to work for nuclear disarmament. Members include political leaders, military personnel, business professionals, physicians, scientists, lawyers, religious leaders, communities of faith, artists, musicians, actors, students and concerned citizens everywhere. General Charles Horner, former President Jimmy Carter, May Angelou and Dr. Jane Goodall are just a few of the prestigious public figures who support nuclear disarmament (http://www.globalnucleardisarernent.org/gdi/you.html).

Nuclear proliferation, that is, the research and manufacture of nuclear weapons, is alive and well here in New Mexico, the birthplace of the atomic bomb. The continued possession, further development and manufacture of nuclear weapons by the United States undermines the ethical basis of our society. Breaks treaties our nation has signed, wastes our nation’s wealth, and permanently contaminates our environment, while providing no real contribution to U.S. national security.

This concrete manifestation of what Dr. King calls “spiritual death,” this black hole of military spending, ironically provides us with a unique opportunity for “spiritual resurrection,” if we choose to take the road of action with confidence. This means saying no to nuclear proliferation and yes to nuclear disarmament on behalf of humanity and the planet. The Los Alamos Study Group asks you to join more than 1000 New Mexicans and 200 New Mexico businesses and organizations that have made this choice by signing the “Call for Nuclear Disarmament.” It is up to citizens to disrupt the trend of socio-political isolation and rally public discourse about the illegal production of nuclear weapons.

GOALS FOR DISARMAMENT

You may be asking yourself, what does the “Call for Nuclear Disarmament” have to do with me? This is not simply a local petition; it is New Mexico’s voice in the global chorus of numerous declarations against nuclear proliferation and the unjust violence inherent in the construction and threat of deployment of nuclear weapons. The World Court project states that “declarations [for nuclear disarmament] are therefore not petitions. They are not simply political tools. They are personal commitments intended to contribute towards the development of international law.” This concept is the philosophical basis for the Los Alamos Study Group’s “Call for Nuclear Disarmament,” which states four concrete goals for disarmament:

1. Stop design and manufacture of all nuclear weapons, including plutonium bomb cores.
2. Dismantle our nuclear arsenal in concert with other nuclear powers, pursuant to Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.
3. Halt the disposal of nuclear waste at Los Alamos.
4. Demand sensible priorities for health care for everyone, better education, renewable energy and economic opportunity for those who don’t have it.

The organization is a nonprofit whose careful research on the activities of nuclear weapons labs in New Mexico is devoted to educating the public on matters of nuclear activity and facilitating positive change in New Mexico, as well as nationally and internationally. Our work includes research and scholarship, education of decision-makers, creation of an information clearinghouse for journalists, organizing, litudinating and advertising. We place particular emphasis on the education and training of young activists and scholars.

We are currently working even harder to bring our research into the public eye and to invite the public to become engaged in our research and action by joining the registry of public resistance to nuclear proliferation, 2005 is an important year for nuclear policy. In May a delegation from the Los Alamos Study Group will attend the five-year NPT Review Conference at the United Nations in New York. On July 15 and 16, we will host twointernational events in Albuquerque and Santa Fe, “Mirrider Than the Sword: Westsider Than the Sword: Writer, Writers Address the Nuclear Age,” to mark the 60th anniversary of the world's first nuclear explosion at the Trinity Site in New Mexico. To commemorate the 60th anniversary of the devastation of Hiroshima, August 6, and Nagasaki, August 9, the Study Group, in cooperation with many other organizations, will host “Hiroshima 60 Years,” an all-day commemorative event on August 6 at Ashley Pond in Los Alamos. All are great opportunities to speak up where it really counts.

TO ENDORSE THE "CALL"

Silence in the fact of nuclear proliferation communicates support for the illegal, immoral industry of maintaining, researching, creating and deploying nuclear and other weapons. To sign the “Call for Nuclear Disarmament” is to join your fellow concerned New Mexicans, owners of local businesses and leaders of nonprofit organizations and churches as well as people around the world in a declaration of public conscience. We need every individual, business, organization and church to endorse the “Call for Nuclear Disarmament,” and click on the “Endorse the Call” button at the right of the page. Let’s speak out, New Mexico. It’s our issue.

For more information on how to get involved and to endorse the “Hiroshima 60 Years” August 6 event, visit our website at www.laog.org, e-mail Claire Long at clong@lasg.org, or reach us by phone at 505-265-1200.

GUEST EDITORIAL

W e as a nation must undergo a radical revolution of values.... A nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual death. "The words of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. ring with a relevance in this crucial time when the Bush administration has sent Congress the most massive military budget in our nation’s history or the history of the world, including expenditures for a new generation of nuclear weapons. This "spiritual death" referred to by Dr. King is not something ethereal and vague; rather, it is well within our power to transcend. One crucial component in the effort to decrease military spending and bolster citizens’ well-being is to take a stand against nuclear weapons.

Nuclear proliferation, that is, the research and manufacture of nuclear weapons, is alive and well here in New Mexico, the birthplace of the atomic bomb. The continued possession, further development and manufacture of nuclear weapons by the United States undermines the ethical basis of our society, breaks treaties our nation has signed, wastes our nation’s wealth, and permanently contaminates our environment, while providing no real contribution to U.S. national security.

This concrete manifestation of what Dr. King calls “spiritual death,” this black hole of military spending, ironically provides us with a unique opportunity for “spiritual resurrection,” if we choose to take the road of action with confidence. This means saying no to nuclear proliferation and yes to nuclear disarmament on behalf of humanity and the planet. The Los Alamos Study Group asks you to join more than 1000 New Mexicans and 200 New Mexico businesses and organizations that have made this choice by signing the “Call for Nuclear Disarmament.” It is up to citizens to disrupt the trend of socio-political isolation and rally public discourse about the illegal production of nuclear weapons.

NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION ILLEGAL

Illegal? Yes, nuclear proliferation is indeed illegal, as stated in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), ratified in 1970 by the United States and 187 other countries. The U.S. and other nuclear powers are therefore legally bound to abide by all articles within the treaty, including Article VI of the NPT, which clearly calls for all parties of the treaty to pursue "... complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.”

Illegal? Yes, nuclear proliferation is indeed illegal, as stated in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), ratified in 1970 by the United States and 187 other countries. The U.S. and other nuclear powers are therefore legally bound to abide by all articles within the treaty, including Article VI of the NPT, which clearly calls for all parties of the treaty to pursue "... complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.”
The Nuclear Disarmament Imperative

"We as a nation must undergo a radical revolution of values... A nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual death."

Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

The continued possession, further development, and manufacture of nuclear weapons by the United States here in N.M. undermines the ethical basis of our society, breaks treaties our nation has signed, wastes our nation's wealth, and permanently contaminates our environment, while providing no real contribution to U.S. national security. This concrete manifestation of what Dr. King calls "spiritual death," this black hole of military spending, ironically provides us with a unique opportunity for "spiritual resurrection," if we choose to take the road of action with confidence.

This means saying "No" to nuclear proliferation and "Yes" to nuclear disarmament on behalf of humanity and the planet. The Los Alamos Study Group asks you to join more than 1000 New Mexicans and 200 New Mexico businesses and organizations that have made this choice by signing the "Call for Nuclear Disarmament." It is up to citizens to disrupt the trend of socio-political isolation and revitalize public discourse about the illegal production of nuclear weapons.

Illegal? Yes, nuclear proliferation is indeed illegal as stated in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) ratified in 1970 by the United States and 187 other countries. The US and other nuclear powers are therefore legally bound to abide by all articles within the treaty, including Article VI of the NPT which clearly calls for all parties of the Treaty to pursue "...complete disarmament under strict and effective international control."

The current nuclear weapons budget for Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL) has tripled the average expenditures during the Cold War era. LANL is the largest facility for WMD in the world in dollar terms. Sandia National Laboratory is next in size. Almost half of U.S. nuclear warhead spending now occurs in New Mexico. Soon, LANL will be the only site in the U.S. that fabricates plutonium pits (bomb cores), which are necessary for making completely new nuclear weapons. LANL also houses the largest active nuclear disposal site in the Southwest.

According to a recent poll conducted by the Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) and Knowledge Networks, 84% of Americans believe it a good idea to work toward eliminating nuclear weapons as part of the non-proliferation treaty" (check-out "Americans on WMD Proliferation," at http://www.pipa.org/ and search for "April 15, 2004").

The "Call for Nuclear Disarmament" is not simply a local petition; it is New Mexico's voice in the global chorus of numerous declarations against nuclear proliferation and the unjust violence inherent in the construction and threat of deployment of nuclear weapons.

The Los Alamos Study Group's "Call for Nuclear Disarmament," states 4 concrete goals for disarmament:
1) Stop designing and manufacture of all nuclear weapons including plutonium bomb cores.
2) Dismantle our nuclear arsenal in concert with other nuclear powers, pursuant to Article VI of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty.
3) Halt the disposal of nuclear waste at Los Alamos; and finally,
4) We demand sensible priorities for health care for everyone, better education, renewable energy and economic opportunity for those who have not.

Here in New Mexico we have an important historical imperative and current responsibility with regard to nuclear weapons research, development and production. While federal funding continues to pour into our state at a higher rate per capita than any other state, New Mexico's poverty rates climb, and our public education system is rated as the worst in the nation. The Los Alamos Study Group formed in 1989, is a nonprofit organization whose careful research on the activity of nuclear weapons labs in New Mexico is devoted to educating the public on matters of nuclear activity and facilitating positive change in New Mexico, as well as nationally and internationally.

To sign the "Call for Nuclear Disarmament" is to join your fellow concerned New Mexicans, owners of local businesses and leaders of non-profit organizations and churches as well as people around the world in a declaration of public conscience. Please go to our web site, www.lasg.org, "Endorse the Call" button at the right of the page. Let's speak out New Mexico. It's our issue.

For more information on how to get involved, to join the "Call for Nuclear Disarmament," or to endorse the Hiroshima 60 Years August 6th event, visit our website www.lasg.org, email Claire Long at clong@lasg.org or reach us by phone: (505)265-1200.
By WALTER PINCUS
The Washington Post

WASHINGTON — The head of the nation's nuclear-weapons programs proposed Monday that Congress approve funds to study the feasibility of building a new, more reliable nuclear warhead that could be deployed without nuclear testing in less than 10 years.

Saying the current Cold War stockpile is inadequate technically and militarily, Linton F. Brooks, administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration, told the Senate Armed Services subcommittee on strategic forces: "We want to explore whether there is a better way to sustain existing military capabilities in our stockpile absent nuclear testing."

Recognizing such a proposal could be highly controversial, Brooks emphasized that a new nuclear warhead is "still just a vision, nothing more," and that even planning for a feasibility study is "at the very early stages of development."

But he insisted the yields of most of the nuclear warheads in the current stockpiles, built to attack Soviet hard targets, "are probably too high." Because their casings were not designed to penetrate earth, "we have no capability against hardened, deeply buried targets." He also described the current stockpile as "unsuited for some specialized missions" caused by post-Cold War situations.

"Today's stockpile may not be the stockpile you want to have 20 years from now," Brooks concluded.

Greg Mello, director of the Los Alamos Study Group, an anti-nuke group in Albuquerque, took note of the policy shift. "This is the first time NNSA has openly spoken about building plutonium cores for new weapons — and doing so soon, at Los Alamos," he said. "This is also the first time the Bush Administration has requested funds for manufacturing equipment specifically for these new weapons."

The push for new weapons is about a need for work to train a new generation of weaponeers at Los Alamos and Sandia national laboratories, Mello said, "before the graybeards retire and die."

Although Sen. Bill Nelson, D-Fla., had to leave the afternoon session early to attend the White House ceremony awarding the Medal of Honor to a Floridian, he gave an indication of the questions that others will raise in discussing the new warhead feasibility study.

"Is it an opportunity to have a serious review and discussion of nuclear weapons and nuclear policy?" Nelson asked. "Or is it just an excuse to develop a new nuclear weapon and to return to nuclear-weapons testing?"

Brooks said the warheads would be designed to be less sensitive to aging and would be easier to certify as safe and reliable. He said money for the feasibility study would be taken from what Congress approved last year to initiate a so-called Reliable Replacement Warhead program that was originally proposed to study replacement parts for current warheads, designed almost 30 years ago and now being updated.

Those funds and new ones added in the proposed fiscal 2006 budget would be used "to begin concept and feasibility studies on replacement warheads or warhead components that provide comparable military capabilities to existing warheads," Brooks said.

If those studies produced a feasible program, he added, by 2012 to 2015 "we should be able to demonstrate through a small build of warheads that a reliable replacement warhead can be manufactured and certified without nuclear testing."
A-bomb survivor to speak about Hiroshima

By DIANA HEIL
The New Mexican

When the mushroom cloud exploded over Hiroshima, Japan, on Aug. 6, 1945, Keijiro Matsushima was contemplating a difficult calculus question in school. He was 16.

He heard the blast, ducked under his desk, then emerged covered in blood. The windows in his classroom had broken.

He crawled out of the school building, bandaged a friend's cut and took him to the Red Cross Hospital. In the streets, he saw burned, swollen and disfigured faces. Peeling skin hung off bodies.

"The road was full of terribly wounded people walking in a procession like ghosts; others were sitting on a cart being pulled by another person and still others were lying or sitting lifelessly on the sidewalks," Matsushima remembers.

An estimated 140,000 people died that year.

Now 76 and a retired junior-high principal, Matsushima is traveling the world to share his recollections of the first atomic bomb explosion in history. This week, he'll be in Los Alamos — the birthplace of the atomic bomb — and Santa Fe.

"As a survivor of the atomic bomb, I hope to talk to more people of the world about the horror of what happened in Hiroshima, and to cooperate with all people to eliminate nuclear weapons from the face of our earth," he wrote.

Since March 2004, the Hiroshima World Peace Mission has sent Japanese A-bomb survivors, students, activists and journalists to 12 countries to promote nuclear disarmament. The final stop in the tour: the United States.

Upon arriving in Santa Fe today, the Japanese delegation will do a radio interview with KSFR's Diego Mulligan.

If you go ...

What: Hiroshima World Peace Mission, public presentation and discussion
When: 7 to 9 p.m. Friday
Where: Cloud Cliff Bakery, 1805 Second St.
Cost: Donations welcome
Sponsor: Los Alamos Study Group, an anti-nuke nonprofit organization based in Albuquerque
Information: 265-1220

On Friday morning, members of the Hiroshima World Peace Mission will take a van tour of Los Alamos National Laboratory and meet with lab officials at the Bradbury Science Museum.

Back in Santa Fe, the group will present Mayor Larry Delgado with sunflowers, an international symbol for nuclear disarmament, at 2 p.m.

Friday outside City Hall. In the evening, the public can meet the Japanese delegation at Cloud Cliff Bakery during a presentation.
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DIANA HELI | The New Mexican
April 7, 2005

When the mushroom cloud exploded over Hiroshima, Japan, on Aug. 6, 1945, Keijiro Matsushima was contemplating a difficult calculus question in school. He was 16.

He heard the blast, ducked under his desk, then emerged covered in blood. The windows in his classroom had broken.

He crawled out of the school building, bandaged a friend's cut and took him to the Red Cross Hospital. In the streets, he saw burned, swollen and disfigured faces. Peeling skin hung off bodies.

"The road was full of terribly wounded people walking in a procession like ghosts; others were sitting on a cart being pulled by another person and still others were lying or sitting lifelessly on the sidewalks," Matsushima remembers.

An estimated 140,000 people died that year.

Now 76 and a retired junior-high principal, Matsushima is traveling the world to share his recollections of the first atomic bomb explosion in history. This week, he'll be in Los Alamos -- the birthplace of the atomic bomb -- and Santa Fe.

"As a survivor of the atomic bomb, I hope to talk to more people of the world about the horror of what happened in Hiroshima, and to cooperate with all people to eliminate nuclear weapons from the face of our earth," he wrote.

Since March 2004, the Hiroshima World Peace Mission has sent Japanese A-bomb survivors, students, activists and journalists to 12 countries to promote nuclear disarmament. The final stop in the tour: the United States.

Upon arriving in Santa Fe today, the Japanese delegation will do a radio interview with KSFR's Diego Mulligan.

On Friday morning, members of the Hiroshima World Peace Mission will take a van tour of Los Alamos National Laboratory and meet with lab officials at the Bradbury Science Museum.

Back in Santa Fe, the group will present Mayor Larry Delgado with sunflowers, an international symbol for nuclear disarmament, at 2 p.m. Friday outside City Hall. In the evening, the public can meet the Japanese delegation at Cloud Cliff Bakery during a presentation.

Comments
Democrats and American arms control groups warned yesterday that a new Bush administration scheme to replace ageing nuclear warheads could be used as a cover for the eventual construction of a "black arsenal" of new weapons.

The plan, known as the reliable replacement warhead programme (RRW), was unveiled this week by Linton Brooks, the head of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Instead of maintaining the old stockpile by monitoring the warheads and replacing occasional spare parts, RRW would entail the design, production and deployment of a new generation of warheads. These would not require testing, and therefore would not break the US moratorium on nuclear tests.

Mr Brooks said the new warheads would be used in existing cold war era weapons. The construction of a warhead production facility would also maintain the expertise and infrastructure for the US to respond flexibly to new threats.

"We need to maintain the capability to respond to potential future requirements," he said.

Congresswoman Ellen Tauscher, a California Democrat and one of the party's leading voices on military issues, alleged that the administration was using the scheme as a cover for developing a range of "smaller and more usable" weapons which were blocked last year by Congress.

"This administration doesn't take no for an answer," Ms Tauscher told The Guardian. "But every time we erect a fence they jump it."

Congress blocked development funds for the proposed robust nuclear earth penetrator, a "bunker-buster" for destroying enemy stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction or underground command posts. The legislature also stopped the advanced concepts initiative, a broad-ranging research programme for developing a new generation of weapons.

Opponents said both projects would undermine global counter-proliferation efforts and could eventually tempt policymakers to use a new generation of smaller weapons in a crisis.

Greg Mello, the head of the watchdog organisation the Los Alamos Study Group, said the RRW plan could have the same impact because it enabled the nuclear laboratories to custom-build small numbers of a range of warheads. He said: "It raises the spectre of a
separate arsenal - a black arsenal beyond public oversight.

"This is a way to perpetuate the nuclear weapons complex in its full panoply of capabilities and to allow the US nuclear stockpile to evolve for new missions under the guise of so-called reliability problems," Mr Mello went on.

"It is not compatible with US and other efforts to counter proliferation and it sends the wrong message around the world."

Bryan Wilkes, a spokesman for Mr Brooks said that the RRW plan was being misinterpreted. "The last new weapon in the stockpile is 20 years old," Mr Wilkes said. "If there is a problem with a component, you might have an entire class of weapons that goes bad. What we need is a way to replace some of those components. We are not talking about new weapons of new designs."

Mr Brooks argued that the RRW programme would lead to a reduction in the US arsenal rather than its expansion. He said the new warheads would be so reliable they would not need testing, and would not require the current large reserve of warheads on standby in case of malfunctions in the existing plutonium weapons.

"Establishing a responsive nuclear infrastructure will provide opportunities for additional stockpile reductions because we can rely less on the stockpile and more on infrastructure," Mr Brooks said.

Stronger Steps Sought against Cluster Bombs
By Stefania Bianchi
Inter Press Service
Friday 08 April 2005

Brussels -- Stronger regulations are needed to protect civilians from cluster munitions during and following armed conflict, a group of leading human rights groups says.

A consortium of civil society groups, made up of the New York-based Human Rights Watch (HRW) and the Belgium-based non-governmental organizations Handicap International and Netwerk Vlaanderen say the international community must halt the production, sale and use of such weapons, which they say harm hundreds of innocent civilians each year.

'The immediate effect and long-term impact of the use of cluster munitions over the past 40 years have demonstrated that cluster munitions pose unacceptable risks to civilians, yet little has been done to reduce the supply of and demand for the weapon, or to regulate its production, trade or use,' the groups said in a statement released during a press conference Thursday (Apr. 7).

'There is no transparency requirement in any conventional arms control regime that requires states to declare or notify other states of sales or transfers of cluster munitions,' they added.

Cluster bombs are weapons that contain a number of bomblets which get scattered over a wide area. Cluster munitions include artillery projectiles, aerially delivered bombs, and rockets or missiles that can be delivered by surface or from the air.

Submunitions delivered by cluster munitions are highly explosive and can be delivered in very large numbers from a long distance. However, many fail to explode and become explosive remnants of war (ERW), and these threaten the lives of civilians who come into
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Hiroshima Survivor Speaks Out for Peace

That was the hellish scene throughout the city, Matsushima said. Death was everywhere. By the end of 1945, an estimated 140,000 people had died as a result of the bomb.

Matsushima said he was grateful that his mother had already left the city. She decided to stay in the city. After making it to where his mother had been staying, he ended up in bed for a week because of a high fever and diarrhea.

Matsushima said he started going out and speaking against nuclear proliferation three or four years ago, after retiring from the junior high school. He acknowledged that convincing the world's nuclear powers to give up their weapons will be difficult. But he said he hopes a nuclear weapon is never again used.

During this trip, the delegation toured Los Alamos National Laboratory, the atomic bomb's birthplace.

"When we went to Los Alamos, I prayed for a while that the spirits of the victims could rest in peace," Matsushima said.

Erwin Rivera, one of about a dozen people at the news conference, said that the first atomic bomb victims were the Pajarito homesteaders who were driven off their land at gunpoint.

"They're not weapons; they're a crime against humanity," said Robert Johnson. "We can't use them."

Chavez isn't the first city official in Santa Fe to take a stand against nuclear weapons. Mayor Larry Delgado in January joined Mayors for Peace, a worldwide anti-nuclear-weapons organization.

The Hiroshima World Peace Mission is a project of the Hiroshima International Cultural Foundation and the Chugoku Shimbun Newspaper.
Hiroshima Survivor Delivers Anti-Nuke Message

Martin Salazar Journal Staff Writer

Horrific images of melted flesh and swollen bodies still haunt Keijiro Matsushima, a 76-year-old who survived the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima on Aug. 6, 1945.

"I could see the whole city was burning already. I could feel Hiroshima -- my own city -- was dying," said Matsushima, one of six members of a Japanese delegation in Santa Fe to lobby city officials to pass a nuclear disarmament resolution.

The resolution, introduced by Councilor Miguel Chavez, would put the Santa Fe City Council on record opposing the development of more nuclear weapons and calling for existing ones to be dismantled. It asks the United States to comply with a 1969 treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. The full council is slated to act on the resolution at its Wednesday meeting.

At least one member of the governing body, Councilor David Pfeffer, has expressed opposition to the measure, saying that councilors should not be discussing issues of national security when they have local issues to worry about.

At a brief news conference by the St. Francis of Assisi statue in front of City Hall on Friday afternoon, Chavez welcomed and exchanged gifts with the delegation from the Hiroshima World Peace Mission.

The news conference was organized by the Los Alamos Study Group, an organization working toward nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament.

"Bienvenidos to the city of Santa Fe," Chavez told the delegates from the Hiroshima World Peace Mission. He said he hoped they could work together in the spirit of peace and reconciliation.

Matsushima said he was impressed with the city's efforts on nuclear disarmament. He handed the councilor a bouquet of sunflowers, the international symbol for nuclear disarmament.

"I am one of the survivors," Matsushima said. "The purpose of this mission is to transmit our experience on the effects of Hiroshima."

A 16-year-old student at the time, Matsushima was sitting in class on the second floor of a two-story building roughly 1.2 miles from where the bomb was dropped. About 15 minutes after class began, he looked out the window and spotted American bombers flying above.

Moments later, as Matsushima was redirecting his attention to his textbook, the first atomic bomb exploded. He recalls a blinding flash, his school shaking and windows shattering.

"I jumped under the desk, and a huge noise followed," Matsushima said, later adding that the roof had collapsed. Outside, the city was plunged into darkness as a mushroom cloud enveloped it.
"I was just crawling around on the floor in blood," he said. But Matsushima sustained only minor cuts from the shattered glass, injuries that paled in comparison to others who, he said, were badly burned, their clothing disintegrated and skin hanging from their bodies. Some people's bodies were "swollen up like pigs.

That was the hellish scene throughout the city, Matsushima said. Death was everywhere. By the end of 1945, an estimated 140,000 people had died as a result of the bomb.

Matsushima said he was grateful that his mother had already left the city. After making it to where his mother had been staying, he ended up in bed for a week because of a high fever and diarrhea.

Matsushima said he only started going out and speaking against nuclear proliferation three or four years ago, after retiring from the junior high where he worked for 40 years. He acknowledged that convincing the world's nuclear powers to give up their weapons will be difficult. But he said he hopes a nuclear weapon is never again used.

During this trip, the delegation toured Los Alamos National Laboratory, the atomic bomb's birthplace.

"When we went to Los Alamos, I prayed for a while that the spirits of the victims could rest in peace," Matsushima said.

Erwin Rivera, one of about a dozen people at the news conference, said that the first atomic bomb victims were the Pajarito homesteaders who were driven off their land at gunpoint.

"They're not weapons; they're a crime against humanity," said Robert Johnson. "We can't use them."

Chavez isn't the first city official in Santa Fe to take a stand against nuclear weapons. Mayor Larry Delgado in January joined Mayors for Peace, a worldwide anti-nuclear-weapons organization.

The Hiroshima World Peace Mission is a project of the Hiroshima International Cultural Foundation and the Chugoku Shim bun Newspaper.
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Horrific images of melted flesh and swollen bodies still haunt Keijiro Matsushima, a 76-year-old who survived the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima on Aug. 6, 1945.

"I could see the whole city was burning already. I could feel Hiroshima -- my own city -- was dying," said Matsushima, one of six members of a Japanese delegation in Santa Fe to lobby city officials to pass a nuclear disarmament resolution.

The resolution, introduced by Councilor Miguel Chavez, would put the Santa Fe City Council on record opposing the development of more nuclear weapons and calling for existing ones to be dismantled. It asks the United States to comply with a 1969 treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. The full council is slated to act on the resolution at its Wednesday meeting.

At least one member of the governing body, Councilor David Pfeffer, has expressed opposition to the measure, saying that councilors should not be discussing issues of national security when they have local issues to worry about.

At a brief news conference by the St. Francis of Assisi statue in front of City Hall on Friday afternoon, Chavez welcomed and exchanged gifts with the delegation from the Hiroshima World Peace Mission.

The news conference was organized by the Los Alamos Study Group, an organization working toward nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament.

"Bienvenidos to the city of Santa Fe," Chavez told the delegates from the Hiroshima World Peace Mission. He said he hoped they could work together in the spirit of peace and reconciliation.

Matsushima said he was impressed with the city's efforts on nuclear disarmament. He handed the councilor a bouquet of sunflowers, the international symbol for nuclear disarmament.

"I am one of the survivors," Matsushima said. "The purpose of this mission is to transmit our experience on the effects of Hiroshima."

A 16-year-old student at the time, Matsushima was sitting in class on the second floor of a two-story building roughly 1.2 miles from where the bomb was dropped. About 15 minutes after class began, he looked out the window and spotted American bombers flying above.

Moments later, as Matsushima was redirecting his attention to his textbook, the first atomic bomb exploded. He recalls a blinding flash, his school shaking and windows shattering.

"I jumped under the desk, and a huge noise followed," Matsushima said, later adding that the roof had collapsed. Outside, the city was plunged into darkness as a mushroom cloud enveloped it.

"I was just crawling around on the floor in blood," he said. But Matsushima sustained only minor cuts from
the shattered glass, injuries that paled in comparison to others who, he said, were badly burned, their clothing disintegrated and skin hanging from their bodies. Some people's bodies were "swollen up like pigs.

That was the hellish scene throughout the city, Matsushima said. Death was everywhere. By the end of 1945, an estimated 140,000 people had died as a result of the bomb.

Matsushima said he was grateful that his mother had already left the city. After making it to where his mother had been staying, he ended up in bed for a week because of a high fever and diarrhea.

Matsushima said he only started going out and speaking against nuclear proliferation three or four years ago, after retiring from the junior high where he worked for 40 years. He acknowledged that convincing the world's nuclear powers to give up their weapons will be difficult. But he said he hopes a nuclear weapon is never again used.

During this trip, the delegation toured Los Alamos National Laboratory, the atomic bomb's birthplace.

"When we went to Los Alamos, I prayed for a while that the spirits of the victims could rest in peace," Matsushima said.

Erwin Rivera, one of about a dozen people at the news conference, said that the first atomic bomb victims were the Pajarito homesteaders who were driven off their land at gunpoint.

"They're not weapons; they're a crime against humanity," said Robert Johnson. "We can't use them."

Chavez isn't the first city official in Santa Fe to take a stand against nuclear weapons. Mayor Larry Delgado in January joined Mayors for Peace, a worldwide anti-nuclear-weapons organization.

The Hiroshima World Peace Mission is a project of the Hiroshima International Cultural Foundation and the Chugoku Shimbun Newspaper.
U.S. nuclear warheads plan under fire

By Julian Borger

WASHINGTON, APRIL 9. Democrats and American arms control groups warned yesterday that a new Bush administration scheme to replace ageing nuclear warheads could be used as a cover for the eventual construction of a "black arsenal" of new weapons.

The plan, known as the reliable replacement warhead programme (RRW), was unveiled this week by Linton Brooks, the head of the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Instead of maintaining the old stockpile by monitoring the warheads and replacing occasional spare parts, RRW would entail the design, production and deployment of a new generation of warheads. These would not require testing, and therefore would not break the U.S. moratorium on nuclear tests.

Mr. Brooks said the new warheads would be used in existing cold war era weapons.

The construction of a warhead production facility would also maintain the expertise and infrastructure for the U.S. to respond flexibly to new threats.

"A covert plan"

"We need to maintain the capability to respond to potential future requirements," he said.

Congresswoman Ellen Tauscher, a California Democrat and one of the party's leading voices on military issues, alleged that the administration was using the scheme as a cover for developing a range of "smaller and more usable" weapons which were blocked last year by Congress.

"This administration doesn't take no for an answer," Ms. Tauscher told The Guardian. "But every time we erect a fence they jump it."

Congress blocked development funds for the proposed robust nuclear earth penetrator, a "bunker-buster" for destroying enemy stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction or underground command posts.

The legislature also stopped the advanced concepts initiative, a broad-ranging research programme for developing a new generation of weapons.
Opponents said both projects would undermine global counter-proliferation efforts and could eventually tempt policymakers to use a new generation of smaller weapons in a crisis.

Greg Mello, the head of the watchdog organisation the Los Alamos Study Group, said the RRW plan could have the same impact because it enabled the nuclear laboratories to custom-build small numbers of a range of warheads.

He said: "It raises the spectre of a separate arsenal — a black arsenal beyond public oversight.

"This is a way to perpetuate the nuclear weapons complex in its full panoply of capabilities and to allow the U.S. nuclear stockpile to evolve for new missions under the guise of so-called reliability problems," Mr. Mello went on.

- Guardian Newspapers Limited 2005
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Energy chairman offers resignation

The chairman of the joint city/county task force on energy offered his resignation Tuesday in the wake of differences of opinion with a majority of the nine-member task force.

Mark Sardella told the Santa Fe County Commission on Tuesday that after nine meetings of the Energy Task Force, he didn't believe the group was willing or able to go in the right direction. Most task-force members have shown a willingness to review electricity expansion plans by Public Service Company of New Mexico, he said.

Sardella, who heads a nonprofit called Local Energy, which seeks to protect the community from rising energy costs, wants the group to also work on a characterization of the electric load in Santa Fe. Such an analysis could challenge the status quo of building new power lines based on the idea that electricity use will continue to rise, he said.

Commissioners Paul Campos and Harry Montoya plan to meet with Sardella to discuss the situation, and Sardella agreed not to tender his resignation immediately.

Bridge to be named after WWII soldiers

A bridge in Cuyamungue will be renamed for two native sons from the small village who died during World War II. The family of cousins Frank and Julian Romero came to Tuesday's County Commission meeting to thank commissioners for the recognition.

Frank Romero, a paratrooper, was killed during the Battle of the Bulge in 1944. Julian Romero, an infantryman, was killed during the invasion of the beach at Normandy.

Frank Romero's brother, Jose Romero, told commissioners that 60 years ago everyone knew about the Romero cousins and their sacrifices for freedom. Now, hardly anyone knows the story, he said. Jose Romero and his five other brothers also served in the military.

Antanacio Romero said his brother, Julian Romero, a 1943 graduate of Santa Fe High School, was drafted the same year he graduated and had recovered from a combat injury before being called on for one of the last major battles in France.

The bridge, which crosses U.S. 84/285, will be formally dedicated as Los Dos Romeros Memorial Bridge during a Memorial Day ceremony.

Councilors to revisit anti-nuke measure

Santa Fe city councilors today are scheduled to consider a resolution asking the United States to comply with a 35-year-old treaty on nuclear nonproliferation.

The item is on the council's "consent calendar," which means the council won't debate the issue unless a councilor asks for a discussion.

Councilor David Pfeffer is the only councilor who has opposed the measure, arguing it is outside the purview of local government.

Doug Doran, a Santa Fe resident who first asked Councilor Miguel Chavez to introduce the resolution, wants it withdrawn because it was rewritten by Greg Mello of the Los Alamos Study Group, and Doran considers that version "too long."

The consent calendar comes near the end of this afternoon's session, starting at 4 p.m. in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

Copyright (c) 2005 The Santa Fe New Mexican
The Santa Fe City Council debated its place in global politics Wednesday before passing a resolution that asks the United States to begin abiding by a 35-year-old nuclear-nonproliferation treaty.

Only Councilor David Pfeffer opposed the measure.

"Every time we do one of these national and international policy resolutions," said Pfeffer, the council's only conservative, "three-quarters of the state rolls its eyes and looks at the state capital and says, 'What are they doing now? Don't they have potholes to fix?'"

Councilor David Coss called Pfeffer's comments about potholes demeaning. "I would like for my great-great-great-grandchildren to be fixing potholes in Santa Fe because we didn't have a nuclear war that ended our society," he said.

Pfeffer specifically objected to a part of the resolution that says nuclear deterrence shouldn't be "the sole prerogative of the United States and a small group of countries friendly to the United States."

"That sounds like a suggestion that it would be a good thing in the world if there was a group of countries who had the nuclear deterrent who were not friendly to the United States," he said. "I think that's what we had for 50 years during the Cold War, and I don't believe that was a good thing."

Pfeffer, who recently changed his party affiliation from Democrat to Republican, also objected to a provision that says it is immoral to believe security can be based on weapons of mass destruction.

"Instruments of mass destruction and the will to use them was what kept us safe for 50 years without a nuclear holocaust in our confrontation with the Soviet Union," he said. "That was something which, in my mind, was quite moral."

In supporting the measure, which calls for the United States to begin complying with the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, other councilors summarily rejected Pfeffer's arguments. The United States ratified the treaty in 1969.

"We're going to have this go-around with Councilor Pfeffer, who has also brought resolutions of national importance forward because he believes in them," said Councilor Patti Bushee. She said later that these included Pfeffer's resolution to support U.S. troops in Iraq.

Councilor Carol Robertson Lopez said as president of the New Mexico Municipal League, "I can certainly tell you that communities around the state are often inspired by some of the resolutions that our community passes."

Councilor Miguel Chavez, who sponsored the resolution, moved for passage after recognizing four people from the Hiroshima World Peace Mission and reading from a letter from Hiroshima's mayor, thanking Mayor Larry Delgado for joining the international organization Mayors for Peace.

More than two dozen supporters of the resolution attended the evening session where a half-dozen of them spoke in favor of it. Doug Doran, who originally asked for the resolution, and Los Alamos Study Group president Greg Mello, who rewrote the original draft, both said they were satisfied with the final version.
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Area G expansion raises concern

DIANA HEIL | The New Mexican
April 27, 2005

Just 20 minutes from the Santa Fe Plaza -- and a mile from the community of White Rock -- a huge inventory of low-level radioactive waste is buried in unlined pits and shafts.

In Los Alamos National Laboratory's Area G, a dump that dates back to 1957, some nuclear-weapons waste is covered with only a few inches of dirt. By contrast, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant near Carlsbad stores radioactive material 2,000 feet underground.

Area G's past is a sore spot among environmentalists. But so is its future. While considering measures for cleaning up Area G, lab officials are planning on expanding the size of Area G from 63 acres to 93 acres as early as this fall.

At a May 3 public forum in Santa Fe, Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board, a federally funded group that advises the Energy Department on environmental issues concerning the lab, will bring together all the players so community members can be informed.

Area G is the largest of more than 20 radioactive waste dumps at Los Alamos. It sits on Mesita del Buey, above the regional aquifer that supplies water to Los Alamos, Santa Fe, Pojoaque and Albuquerque.

"We do not have enough information to ensure the public knows what the long-term impact to the environment will be," Jim Brannon, vice chairman of Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board, said.

Perspectives on Area G are far-flung.

"If this were a municipal landfill, you would never get away with it," James Bearzi, chief of the state Environment Department's Hazardous Waste Bureau, said.

A city dump has tighter controls than Area G, and oversight from the state and the federal Environmental Protection Agency have been limited, he said.

"Citizens and legislators are never given the opportunity to say whether the engineering controls (at Area G) are appropriate because DOE is self-regulated," Bearzi said.

But lab officials beg to differ with the analogy.

City dumps have different monitoring requirements because they can receive a variety of wastes, including small quantities of hazardous waste such as paint, oil, pesticides, herbicides, batteries and computer parts, lab spokeswoman Kathy DeLucas said. Area G, however, only accepts radioactive waste.
"Before waste is disposed of at Area G, we know exactly what we are receiving," DeLucas said. "The waste goes through a very rigorous inspection, characterization and certification process. ... It's a world of difference from your ordinary landfill, and there is no comparison."

The state has a regulatory hook on the situation because of hazardous waste disposed there in the 1980s and 1990s. Under the state Hazardous Waste Act, the Environment Department can impose closure.

But many questions will be up for debate. What gets closed -- the hazardous waste part of Area G only or the entire site? And what does closure mean -- digging up the old stuff and sending it for storage elsewhere or capping the waste on site for years to come?

The implications are far-reaching, not only for people who drink the water and breathe the air, but workers who would be digging 80 feet deep into this type of waste. Everyone from Santa Fe to Los Alamos -- and in between -- has a great need to care, Brannon said.

Twice, Los Alamos lab submitted closure plans for Area G to the state Environment Department, which deemed it inadequate. By this time next year, permits will be due for ongoing waste management at the lab and closure of the old units.

"Under current environmental standards, Area G would never be permitted today," Bearzi said.

The extent of environmental contamination caused by Area G is under investigation. Though releases of known carcinogens have been documented, "nobody knows how far or how much has migrated," Bearzi said.

Greg Mello, who is well acquainted with Area G from his former work as a hydrologist at the state Environment Department and his current work as director of the disarmament nonprofit called the Los Alamos Study Group, said the dump's proximity to springs is part of the problem. "Area G is untenable as a long-term waste site," he said.

His solution would be to dig up and sort the old waste, then ship the dangerous stuff away and bury the other stuff where it is.

The lab's new waste should be packaged, properly characterized and shipped to other sites, such as the Nevada Test Site, which is situated in a drier climate, or WIPP, which is deeper, he said. He also hopes people will explore why Los Alamos continues to make so much nuclear waste.

"Area G is not a health problem today to anyone, except to people who work there maybe," Mello said.

Instead, he frets about the waste falling into the wrong hands. "People could mine the dumps of Los Alamos for the material to build nuclear weapons," he said.

Through Mello's petition efforts, 4,000 people, 200 businesses and 100 organizations have requested that Area G be closed. Still, the battle won't be easy.

"This state has never been able to stand up to the labs," Mello said.
Comments

By Kathleene Parker (Submitted: 04/29/2005 8:06 am)

As a Los Alamos resident for 14 years, I urge all of you to stand back from the particular outrage--of many at this enormous and wasteful nuke lab--and work to educate that it is not part of this nation's security answer, but part of the problem. National security is not just about guarding against attack, it is about the health and well being of the entire nation. Some argue that 9-11 is "proof" we need more funding for such places. To me, it is proof of their absolute uselessness and futility. What did Los Alamos and all its nukes do to make us safer on 9-11? Nothing, because we no longer face the types of enemies that Los Alamos is preoccupied with. The real threat is those of creativity and determination--and a not necessarily large attack budget. Meanwhile, education, infrastructure and this nation's future go down the tubes as we fund places like Los Alamos and wars in nations that had nothing to do with 9-11. And that is our challenge. To break the myth that nuclear weapons equate with anything substantive to national security and that they in fact hurt our national security by deterring us from real priorities, including foreign aid, that might make us safer in the long run.

By Christe Colburn (Submitted: 04/28/2005 1:16 pm)

This is just sick. I am horrified, as well. I hope more read and respond to find a solution.

By Rita Serrano (Submitted: 04/27/2005 2:56 pm)

The damage has been done since it's been there since 1957. Ever wonder why there is such a high instance of cancer in the area?

By atma wiseman (Submitted: 04/27/2005 11:22 am)

I cannot believe that only one other person is horrified about this news

By adie french (Submitted: 04/27/2005 8:26 am)

Indeed the proposed expansion of Area G is worrisome news. It is true that DOE is self-regulated with respect to the low-level radioactive wastes (LLW) buried at Area G, and their justification for keeping the site open (a DOE-issued "Disposal Authorization Statement" or DAS) is based on a Performance Assessment (PA) written in 1997 by -- guess who -- Los Alamos National Laboratory. The assumptions made in the MDA G PA are cleverly chosen so that the site would pass the compliance criteria set forth in DOE Order 5820.2A, which has subsequently been replaced with DOE O 435.1. These assumptions were not questioned by DOE's review body (the
LLW Federal Review Group, or LFRG), which is not particularly surprising. The LFRG used to perform credible reviews, but now has become rather a rubber stamp for DOE sites such as LANL wishing to dispose locally. Major natural features, events, and processes were ignored (e.g. wildfire) or dismissed (e.g. cliff erosion) in the PA, and the site was assumed to be under perpetual institutional control (IC) for the next several millennia, which is patently absurd. Other DOE sites writing PAs do not generally make such outrageous assumptions, but rather stick to the IC period of 100 years as suggested in DOE O 5820.2A itself. If the IC assumption is abandoned, the estimated doses to a hypothetical future resident are too high to meet the DOE regulation, as has been shown in subsequent modeling (by practitioners outside of LANL and DOE). Since the 1997 PA, a great deal more waste has been disposed, and apparently more is expected. The State of NM should perform (or commission) an independent PA and make it public so that the citizens of the State may be adequately informed of the risks posed by MDA G to future generations. Relying on information from DOE alone is asking to be lied to. MDA G should never have received its DAS based on the flawed 1997 PA. It should certainly not be allowed to continue operations. It is interesting to note that the opinion that MDA G should be closed is shared by many people who work at LANL, including a former head of the Environmental Restoration Project, but these people are powerless against the nuclear weapons establishment at the Lab. The weaponeers are all-powerful, and no amount of impotent environmental regulation, see by them as merely a thorn in the side, will make them change their ways. The waste engineers are doing their best to put lipstick on the pig, but the real motivation behind keeping MDA G open and providing flimsy justification for doing so, lies within the NNSA weapons complex. This will not change until the weaponeers are made to answer for their potentially criminal behavior in their disposal of radioactive waste in Los Alamos.
Report From Los Alamos: Update on New Weapons, Failing Democracy, and Localizing Global Resistance

Friday, April 30 10am-12:30pm United Nations, New York Conference Room A

A Panel Discussion Sponsored by the Los Alamos Study Group
Candy Jones - Moderator

Greg Mello: Update on New Weapons and the U.S. Nuclear Weapons Complex

Darwin BondGraham: The Social Contract of Nuclear Weapons

Andy Lichterman: Beyond Arms Control

Willem Malten: Two Tales of Power - Which Will It Be?

Zia Mian: Where Do We Go From Here?

"On behalf of the administration, I would like to thank you and your staff for helping to support this important effort. We are now free to explore a range of technical options that could strengthen our ability to deter, or respond to new or emerging threats without any concern that some ideas could inadvertently violate a vague and arbitrary limitation... We should not fail to take advantage of this opportunity."

- U.S. nuclear weapons chief Linton Brooks to nuclear labs after lifting the mini-nuke ban

"You really get someone's attention when you threaten the existence of their nation."

-- Steve Younger, Senior Fellow, Los Alamos National Laboratory
Area G expansion raises concern

R Forum to address future of LANL’s radioactive dump

By DIANA HEIL The New Mexican

Just 20 minutes from the Santa Fe Plaza — and a mile from the community of White Rock — a huge inventory of low-level radioactive waste is buried in unlined pits and shafts.

In Los Alamos National Laboratory’s Area G, a dump that dates back to 1957, some nuclear-weapons waste is covered with only a few inches of dirt. By contrast, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant near Carlsbad stores radioactive material 2,000 feet underground.

Area G’s past is a sore spot among environmentalists. But so is its future. While considering measures for cleaning up Area G, lab officials are planning on expanding the size of Area G from 63 acres to 93 acres as early as this fall.

At a May 3 public forum in Santa Fe, Northern New Mexico Citizens’ Advisory Board, a federally funded group that advises the Energy Department on environmental issues concerning the lab, will bring together all the players so community members can be informed.

Area G is the largest of more than 20 radioactive waste dumps at Los Alamos. It sits on Mesita del Buey, above the regional aquifer that supplies water to Los Alamos, Santa Fe, Pojoaque and Albuquerque.

“We do not have enough information to ensure the public knows what the longterm impact to the environment will be,” Jim Brannon, vice chairman of Northern New Mexico Citizens’ Advisory Board, said.

Perspectives on Area G are far-flung.

“If this were a municipal landfill, you would never get away with it,” James Bearzi, chief of the state Environment Department’s Hazardous Waste Bureau, said.

A city dump has tighter controls than Area G, and oversight from the state and the federal Environmental Protection Agency have been limited, he said.

“Citizens and legislators are never given the opportunity to say whether the engineering controls (at Area G) are appropriate because DOE is self-regulated,” Bearzi said.

But lab officials beg to differ with the analogy.

City dumps have different monitoring requirements because they can receive a variety of wastes, including small quantities of hazardous waste such as paint, oil, pesticides, herbicides, batteries and computer parts, lab spokeswoman Kathy DeLucas said. Area G, however, only accepts radioactive waste.
“Before waste is disposed of at Area G, we know exactly what we are receiving,” DeLucas said. “The waste goes through a very rigorous inspection, characterization and certification process. ... It’s a world of difference from your ordinary landfill, and there is no comparison.”

The state has a regulatory hook on the situation because of hazardous waste disposed there in the 1980s and 1990s. Under the state Hazardous Waste Act, the Environment Department can impose closure.

But many questions will be up for debate. What gets closed — the hazardous waste part of Area G only or the entire site? And what does closure mean — digging up the old stuff and sending it for storage elsewhere or capping the waste on site for years to come?

The implications are farreaching, not only for people who drink the water and breathe the air, but workers who would be digging 80 feet deep into this type of waste. Everyone from Santa Fe to Los Alamos — and in between — has a great need to care, Brannon said.

Twice, Los Alamos lab submitted closure plans for Area G to the state Environment Department, which deemed it inadequate. By this time next year, permits will be due for ongoing waste management at the lab and closure of the old units.

"Under current environmental standards, Area G would never be permitted today," Bearzi said.

The extent of environmental contamination caused by Area G is under investigation. Though releases of known carcinogens have been documented, "nobody knows how far or how much has migrated," Bearzi said.

Greg Mello, who is well acquainted with Area G from his former work as a hydrologist at the state Environment Department and his current work as director of the disarmament nonprofit called the Los Alamos Study Group, said the dump’s proximity to springs is part of the problem. “Area G is untenable as a long-term waste site,” he said.

His solution would be to dig up and sort the old waste, then ship the dangerous stuff away and bury the other stuff where it is.

The lab’s new waste should be packaged, properly characterized and shipped to other sites, such as the Nevada Test Site, which is situated in a drier climate, or WIPP, which is deeper, he said. He also hopes people will explore why Los Alamos continues to make so much nuclear waste.

“Area G is not a health problem today to anyone, except to people who work there maybe,” Mello said.

Instead, he frets about the waste falling into the wrong hands. “People could mine the dumps of Los Alamos for the material to build nuclear weapons,” he said.

Through Mello’s petition efforts, 4,000 people, 200 businesses and 100 organizations have requested that Area G be closed. Still, the battle won’t be easy.

“This state has never been able to stand up to the labs,” Mello said.
Area G expansion raises concern

The radioactive waste disposal site dates back to 1957, and some nuclear weapons waste is covered with only a few inches of dirt. Lab officials are planning a cleanup of the site, and a May 3 forum in Santa Fe will bring together all the players so the public can be informed. Clyde Mueller The New Mexican
SANTA FE - Fashioning a blockbuster attraction out of a hazardous dump may be a tall order, but that's what the Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board wants to do on May 3.

The group that formally advises the Department of Energy on environmental cleanup at Los Alamos National Laboratory has prepared what it hopes will be a major educational forum, featuring controversial Area G, the lab's largest radioactive landfill area.

The Low-Level Radioactive Solid Waste Storage and Disposal Area, as it is also known, opened in 1957. The landfill began as a five-acre site, then grew to 37 acres in 1978. It is now 66 acres, according to LANL, but may well be expanded again before it is eventually cleaned up and closed down.

In recent years it has been a sore point within the laboratory, attracting the scrutiny of regulators and the scorn of environmentalists.

"When will we know enough of what we need to know to prevent permanent and irrevocable damage to our environment?" asked Jim Brannon, NNM CAB vice chair during a press conference last week.

Although low levels of radioactive and hazardous wastes have been detected in the regional aquifer below Los Alamos, the true extent of the contamination is not yet known.

The lab's most recent environmental surveillance document for 2003 identified high levels of tritium in the south portion of Area G, near the shafts where radioactive tritium is stored, with levels "increasing over time."

The highest concentrations of plutonium isotopes were found in the northern and northeastern portions of the site.

**Forum details**

**Date**: Tuesday, May 3

**Time**: 4:30 p.m. poster sessions; 6:30-9 p.m. public meeting

**Place**: Main administrative building, Jemez Conference Room, College of Santa Fe

**Free to the public**

**Topics under discussion**:

1. History of the radioactive landfill.
2. Current operations and past, present and future disposal.
3. Risks to the workers and the surrounding communities.
4. Future plans and final closure of the landfill.
5. Proposed expansion from 63 acres to 93 acres.

**Questions to be answered**:

1. Has Area G contaminated groundwater or soil?
2. What are the plans for expanding Area G?
3. How has NNSA/DOE regulated Area G?
4. How will Area G be closed and monitored?
5. How does WIPP relate to Area G?

Information: call 989-1662 or visit www.nnmcab.org

At its inception Area G was a step forward, an attempt by the laboratory to consolidate radioactive and chemical waste treatment and storage in a central location rather than leaving them up to individual facilities to manage, lab records show.

More than 10 million cubic feet of hazardous waste has flowed into Area G over the years, much of it buried in unlined pits, but not enough has flowed out to reduce the load placed on the high mesa environment.

Shipment going from LANL to the Waste Isolation Pilot Project near Carlsbad, were suspended in October 2003, until testing procedures could be improved at the DOE sites where the waste originated. Eighteen months later, and well behind schedule, shipments from LANL resumed on April 22.

Area G is located on Mesita del Buey, between Pajarito Canyon and Cañada del Buey in the east-central part of the laboratory in Technical Area 54, north of Pajarito Road. It has been the target of several environmental campaigns against the laboratory.

Some 189 New Mexico businesses, including 117 in Santa Fe, have joined Los Alamos Study Group's call for an end to disposal at Area G, said Greg Mello, the group's executive director.

Joni Arends of Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety will participate in one of the panels.

Board spokespersons said more than 1200 invitations have been sent out. Public service announcements are going out to radio stations and ads will be running in the local papers. The governor and the state's congressional delegation have been invited but not yet confirmed.

There will be presentations by all the major players, the lab, University of California, National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy, Environmental Protection Agency, and the New Mexico Environment Department.

Brannon said that the poster session, panel discussions and public comment scheduled for the seminar were intended to inform and educate the public and to enable the board to take their opinions into account for recommendations on cleaning up and eventually closing out the waste at Area G.

"We think the public needs to know everything that's going on regarding that closure," said Jim Brannon, NNM CAB vice chair. "We'd like to hear what the public has to say and what the regulators have to say about that."

He and his colleagues on the board believe that putting Area G on the map and in the minds of area residents are the best ways to make sure the clean up is handled with an infrotified public's interests in mind.

The NNM CAB is a federally chartered Site Specific Advisory Board, with an annual budget, staff, and offices in Santa Fe.

The board's recommendations relate to waste management, community involvement and environmental monitoring, surveillance and remediation at the laboratory.

The high profile forum reflects a special emphasis that the board has placed on public information and community participation lately.

The forum will take place on Tuesday, May 3, from 4 to 9 p.m. in the main administrative building at Santa Fe Community College in Santa Fe.

See **AREA G**, A3
Board takes a look at Area G
ROGER SNODGRASS, roger@lamonitor.com, Monitor
Assistant Editor

Santa Fe - Fashioning a blockbuster attraction out of a hazardous dump may be a tall order, but that's what the Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board wants to do on May 3.

The group that formally advises the Department of Energy on environmental cleanup at Los Alamos National Laboratory has prepared what it hopes will be a major educational forum, featuring controversial Area G, the lab's largest radioactive landfill area.

The Low-Level Radioactive Solid Waste Storage and Disposal Area, as it is also known, opened in 1957. The landfill began as a five-acre site, then grew to 37 acres in 1976.

It is now 66 acres, according to LANL, but may well be expanded again before it is eventually cleaned up and closed down.

In recent years it has been a sore point within the laboratory, attracting the scrutiny of regulators and the scorn of environmentalists.

"When will we know enough of what we need to know to prevent permanent and irrevocable damage to our environment?" asked Jim Brannon, NNMCAB vice chair during a press conference last week.

Although low levels of radioactive and hazardous wastes have been detected in the regional aquifer below Los Alamos, the true extent of the contamination is not yet known.

The lab's most recent environmental surveillance document for 2003 identified high levels of tritium in the south portion of Area G, near the shafts where radioactive tritium is stored, with levels "increasing over time."
The highest concentrations of plutonium isotopes were found in the northern and northeastern portions of the site.

At its inception Area G was a step forward, an attempt by the laboratory to consolidate radioactive and chemical waste treatment and storage in a central location rather than leaving them up to individual facilities to manage, lab records show.

More than 10 million cubic feet of hazardous waste has flowed into Area G over the years, much of it buried in unlined pits, but not enough has flowed out to reduce the load placed on the high mesa environment.

Shipments going from LANL to the Waste Isolation Pilot Project near Carlsbad, were suspended in October 2003, until testing procedures could be improved at the DOE sites where the waste originated. Eighteen months later, and well behind schedule, shipments from LANL resumed on April 22.

Area G is located on Mesita del Buey, between Pajarito Canyon and Canada del Buey in the east-central part of the laboratory in Technical Area 54, north of Pajarito Road.

It has been the target of several environmental campaigns against the laboratory.

Some 189 New Mexico businesses, including 117 in Santa Fe have joined Los Alamos Study Group's call for an end to disposal at Area G, said Greg Mello, the group's executive director.

Joni Arends of Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety will participate in one of the panels.

Board spokespersons said more than 1200 invitations have been sent out. Public service announcements are going out to radio stations and ads will be running in the local papers. The governor and the state's congressional delegation have been invited but not yet confirmed.

There will be presentations by all the major players, the lab, University of California, National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy, Environmental Protection Agency, and the New Mexico Environment Department.
Brannon said that the poster session, panel discussions and public comment scheduled for the seminar were intended to inform and educate the public and to enable the board to take their opinions into account for recommendations on cleaning up and eventually closing out the waste at Area G.

"We think the public needs to know everything that's going on regarding that closure," said Jim Brannon, NNMCAB vice chair. "We'd like to hear what the public has to say and what the regulators have to say about that."

He and his colleagues on the board believe that putting Area G on the map and in the minds of area residents are the best ways to make sure the clean up is handled with an informed public's interests in mind.

The NNMCAB is a federally chartered Site Specific Advisory Board, with an annual budget, staff, and offices in Santa Fe.

The CAB's recommendations relate to waste management, community involvement and environmental monitoring, surveillance and remediation at the laboratory.

The high profile forum reflects a special emphasis that the board has placed on public information and community participation lately.

The forum will take place on Tuesday, May 3, from 4 to 9 p.m. in the main administrative building at Santa Fe Community College in Santa Fe.
At Los Alamos, Blogging Their Discontent

By WILLIAM J. BROAD

A blog rebellion among scientists and engineers at Los Alamos, the federal government's premier nuclear weapons laboratory, is threatening to end the tenure of its director, G. Peter Nanos.

Four months of jeers, denunciations and defenses of Dr. Nanos's management recently culminated in dozens of signed and anonymous messages concluding that his days were numbered. The postings to a public Web log conveyed a mood of self-congratulation tempered with sober discussion of what comes next.

"Some here will celebrate that they have been able to run the sheriff out of Dodge," Gary Stradling, a veteran Los Alamos scientist who is a staunch defender of Dr. Nanos, wrote Tuesday on the blog.

"It might be a good idea," Mr. Stradling added, "to shut down the celebration and form a work party to clean up Dodge City, because the new sheriff will if we do not."

The blogging comes at a delicate moment in the 62-year history of Los Alamos. The University of California, which has helped run the laboratory for the government since the days of the Manhattan Project, faces close scrutiny in Washington as to whether its contract should be renewed. And resignations and fears of a mass exodus have recently roiled the waters. Some analysts believe that now, given the public outcry, the university will have to abandon Dr. Nanos in order to make a credible bid to keep its contract.

Dr. Nanos would not comment. A spokesman for Los Alamos, Kevin Roark, said false rumors of the director's resignation had circulated for months. Mr. Roark added that Dr. Nanos was extraordinarily proud of what he had accomplished at Los Alamos, which employs 14,000 people on an annual budget of $2.2 billion.

Mr. Roark called the vitriolic blogging unrepresentative of the majority of employees and said it often had the tone of a sophomoric Halloween prank. "Everybody, I think, was a little surprised at how mean it got," he said.

Several outside experts said that the director's quick departure was inevitable and that the blog's attacks were playing a significant role.

"Nanos is leaving," said Greg Mello, the director of the Los Alamos Study Group, a private organization in Albuquerque that monitors weapons laboratories. "The blog changed the climate, giving people an outlet they didn't have before."

Blogs seem to be everywhere. But this one is unusual, in that the Los Alamos National Laboratory, isolated in the mountains of New Mexico, has a long history of maintaining the highest level of federal secrecy. The laboratory's very existence was once classified. Today, barbed wire rings many of its buildings, federal agents monitor its communications, and its employees are constantly reminded that loose lips sink ships.

The blog (www.lanl-the-real-story.blogspot.com) went public in January and since then has registered more than 100,000 visits, with more than half a million pages viewed and more than 5,000 comments. Discussions run on a variety of topics, from the sanctity of retirement benefits to the likely identity of the next contractor who will run Los Alamos.
Since most messages are anonymous, there is no way to know how many laboratory employees contribute to the blog. Even so, from the sheer volume, detail and differing styles of the messages, the number is clearly many more than a handful. The language, often studded with obscure acronyms, suggests that the authors have a deep knowledge of the laboratory's exotic culture.

Furious debate centers on Dr. Nanos, a retired vice admiral of the Navy who holds a doctorate in physics from Princeton and became the laboratory's director two years ago. Many bloggers criticize his decision to shut down most of the laboratory in July, when he cited "egregious" safety and security violations after two computer disks with secret information were reported missing and an intern working with a laser suffered an eye injury. The security alarm turned out to be a clerical error - the disks, in fact, never existed. Still, Dr. Nanos kept many laboratory areas closed for nearly seven months, until late January. In that time, laboratory personnel worked on improving safety and security.

Dr. Thomas J. Meyer, a distinguished chemist and a member of the National Academy of Sciences who oversaw 2,000 employees as associate director of the laboratory's strategic research, resigned in October during the shutdown and afterward filed a long critique of the episode and the director's acts.

"He chose to transfer blame and intimidate individuals even with a staff that was often attempting to implement difficult and complex safety processes," Dr. Meyer said in his critique, which was posted on the blog. He called the director's treatment of laboratory employees "vindictive and abusive."

A banner atop the blog site sets the tone, asserting that the shutdown cost taxpayers "approximately $850 million, an exodus of highly talented staff members, and the loss of untold millions of dollars of funding from customers who have taken their business elsewhere."

Laboratory officials say the shutdown probably cost $120 million, and federal officials recently put the figure at $370 million.

Mr. Roark, the Los Alamos spokesman, said that the laboratory was worried about a recent spike in retirement inquiries. "We're not anticipating a mass exodus," he said. "But that doesn't mean we're not concerned about the possibility. We are."

The blog's creator is Doug Roberts, a computer scientist who is a 20-year laboratory veteran. In an interview, Mr. Roberts said he was inspired to start the blog when he and his colleagues had their critical submissions to a forum on the laboratory's online newspaper rejected.

Mr. Roberts said it was impossible to know how many laboratory personnel contributed to the blog because it was set up to protect their identities, if so desired. He estimated the vocal population at 200 to 500 employees.

The blog runs a petition for Dr. Nanos's removal; it has garnered more than 100 posts, although most are labeled "Anonymous."

One who signed openly in February was Dr. Brad Lee Holian, a theoretical physicist who worked at the laboratory for 32 years. Dr. Holian retired a month later.

"People were feeling like they were in a pressure cooker," he said in an interview. "Nanos is so abusive, not just to the general staff but his underlings. People were afraid to say anything. On the blog they could vent without fear of reprisal."

Jeff Jarvis, who publishes BuzzMachine, a blog that focuses on media issues, said the Los Alamos site showed "a new ethic of transparency" that has come with the explosion of electronic self-publishing. "It's not just the power of the blog," Mr. Jarvis said, "it's the power of the citizen."

The battle over Dr. Nanos comes as the University of California is considering whether to bid to renew its contract,
which expires Sept. 30. Two leading space and military contractors, Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman, have announced an interest in running the laboratory.

Chris Harrington, a university spokesman, denied that Dr. Nanos was about to resign and defended him as "clearly understanding the mission of the lab."

Mr. Harrington added, however, that the university was doing "a thorough review" of its management options for a possible bid on the new contract.

*John Schwartz contributed reporting for this article.*
Protest was in the air at a Santa Fe meeting Tuesday night over a planned Los Alamos National Laboratory nuclear waste dump and storage facility expansion. Panel members from the state Environment Department, the Energy Department and lab environmental watchdogs sparred among themselves and with confrontational audience members over the future of LANL's Area G.

Toward the end of the public forum, hosted and organized by the Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board, audience members began distributing brightly colored posters expressing their discontent over LANL's waste production and management.

"Land of the labs, home of the waste," read one. "Like Waste? You'll Love Los Alamos," read another. "Largest nuclear waste dump in the Southwest 19 miles from the Santa Fe Plaza," read a third. And there were more.

In all, close to 150 people gathered at Santa Fe Community College to learn of LANL and DOE's plans to expand Area G by nearly 50 percent.

Tony Stanford, LANL's facilities and waste operations division leader, told the crowd that the laboratory is running out of space at Area G to permanently bury low-level radioactive waste it generates. The expansion, planned since 1999, will increase Area G by about 30 acres to 93 acres atop one of the mesas adjacent to San Ildefonso Pueblo.

Santa Fean Betsy Millard expressed bewilderment at the decision to expand the site while the lab continues to produce waste.

"You've just got to stop generating this waste" until you figure out how to deal with the waste that has already been buried, she said. "This is just simple, basic responsibility."

Former San Ildefonso Gov. Gilbert Sanchez used fiery language to draw attention to his people's plight, watching what is their ancestral land become contaminated by LANL's waste facilities.

"That is our sacred area," he said. "I don't think a synagogue or a Roman Catholic church would allow you to do the things that you are doing on our ancestral land."

Neil Weber, in charge of the pueblo's environment department, described the waste site and LANL's associated facilities above the pueblo land as "this
insult."

LANL and DOE officials sought to assure the audience that the lab’s monitoring efforts and controls maintain radioactive and chemical emissions from the site well below federal standards.

Ken Hargis, LANL's acting environmental stewardship chief, said that LANL's radioactive emissions make up about 1 percent of the dose people receive in a year just from background sources, such as the sun. He said LANL air emissions of plutonium and americium are all under 5 percent of the federal limit.

To demonstrate their good faith, DOE's John Ordaz, the assistant chief for environmental management at LANL, offered to take anyone interested on a tour of the site and gave out his office and cell phone numbers to the crowd.
Los Alamos wants large nuclear storage dump

Associated Press
May 5, 2005

SANTA FE, N.M. (AP) - A proposal by the U.S. Department of Energy to expand a nuclear waste dump at Los Alamos National Laboratory is drawing criticism.

The nuclear weapons lab is running out of space to permanently bury low-level radioactive waste, said Tony Stanford, Los Alamos facilities and waste operations division leader. The expansion would increase the lab's Area G atop a mesa adjacent to San Ildefonso Pueblo by about 30 acres to 93 acres.

Former San Ildefonso Gov. Gilbert Sanchez has denounced the plan.

"That is our sacred area," Sanchez said. "I don't think a synagogue or a Roman Catholic church would allow you to do the things that you are doing to our ancestral land."

Neil Weber, who heads the pueblo's environment department, labeled the waste site overlooking pueblo land as "this insult."

They spoke at a public forum here Tuesday night that featured panel members from the state Environment Department, the DOE and watchdog groups. The forum sponsored by the Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board drew about 150 people.

Members of the audience handed out brightly colored posters critical of the lab's waste production and management. "Land of the labs, home of the waste," read one, while another declared: "Largest nuclear waste dump in the Southwest 19 miles from the Santa Fe Plaza."

Betsy Millard of Santa Fe suggested the lab stop generating waste while it figures out how to deal with the amount it's already got.

"This is just simple, basic responsibility," she said.

DOE and lab officials said Los Alamos' monitoring efforts and controls keep emissions from radioactive sources and chemicals at the site well below federal limits.

Radioactive emissions from the lab account for about 1 percent of the dose people receive in a year from background sources such as the sun, said Ken Hargis, environmental stewardship chief for the lab. LANL air emissions of plutonium and americium are under 5 percent of the federal limit, Hargis said.
Forum weighs nuke waste area expansion

ROGER SNODGRASS, roger@lamonitor.com, Monitor Assistant Editor

SANTA FE - A seminar Tuesday on Area G, Los Alamos National Laboratory's radioactive waste disposal area, revealed long-term expansion plans, while exposing rifts between the weapons lab and its political and environmental critics.

Tony Stanford, the lab's nuclear waste leader said that Area G, with only one of its excavated pits still active, is reaching its current capacity for low-level waste burial, but that the area still had a long future.

On the basis of an environmental assessment already made, the National Nuclear Security Administration has decided to expand operations into 30 acres of an untapped section in the area known as Zone 4.

The plan is to abide by the New Mexico Environmental Department's Consent Order, signed in March, which calls for the closure of Area G by 2015, but to begin opening the new zone within the next few months.

John Ordaz, DOE's assistant manager for environmental stewardship at the laboratory, said he had learned on a recent visit to Washington that a new site wide environmental impact statement would be done, because of new NNSA anticipated consolidation activities within the weapons program.

A supplemental impact statement for LANL is currently underway, but Ordaz said that the new document was called for because of "changes in programmatic activities."

Ken Hargis, LANL's environmental stewardship division leader, described the lab's monitoring program that continually studies exposure risks at Area G from four defined pathways - inhalation, direct contact, water and food.

"The exposure is very small," he said.

Even the individual with the greatest risk of exposure receives only 1 percent of the radioactive dose that the same person receives from all background sources, including natural radon and cosmic radiation,
he noted.

Traces of radioactive tritium, plutonium, americium and cesium, while present in the Area G environment are only a fraction of DOE's acceptable dose standards, according to the lab's studies.

Exposure by all pathways, for example, based on composite information and projected from the beginning of the site in 1957 for 1,000 years would contribute 5.5 millirem per year out of a total of 100 millirem allowed by DOE.

The meeting, organized by Northern New Mexico Citizens Advisory Board, included a presentation by a representative of neighboring San Ildefonso Pueblo, who described the DOE landfill as an insult and a desecration of cultural resources.

Neil Webber, the pueblo's environmental director, was criticized at the meeting by former San Ildefonso Gov. Gilbert Sanchez for minimizing the pueblo's complaint.

Joni Arends, executive director of Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety, asked the advisory board to recommend that DOE apply itself to protecting the Rio Grande.

"Stop burying waste in unlined pits, trenches and shafts at Area G," she demanded.

She also recommended an end to the current practice of storing vulnerable drums of transuranic waste in tents constructed with Tedlar, a polyvinyl fluoride film, calling for them to be replaced by Hardened On-Site Structures that could withstand a Boeing 747 crash.

Future conflicts between the laboratory and the NMED were foreshadowed, when hazardous waste chief James Bearzi vowed that the state would issue two draft permits under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act within the next nine months.

The permits would govern ongoing operations at the laboratory, including the storage of hazardous waste and closure requirements for contaminated sites like Area G.

He read a statement by NMED Secretary Ron Curry calling for more openness on issues related to Area G.

"I hope LANL uses this meeting to begin the process of 'raising the veil' on Area G and their future plans," Curry said in the statement.

Bearzi said the state's primary concern was a plume of tritium vapor that has been detected but not definitely
measured in the area below the low-waste dump.

Tritium, while having a relatively short half-life of about 12 years, is indicative of contaminant transport by water.

Both Bearzi and Rick Mayer, the Environmental Protection Administration's site officer at LANL, directly answered the advisory board's first question on whether there was contamination in the soil or water at Area G in the affirmative.

Mayer said current investigations, which include drilling 37 boreholes under the state's consent order would help define the tritium plume.

Concerning hazardous chemicals, he noted that no PCB's (Polychlorinated Biphenyls) have so far been discovered above detection limits in storm water runoff from Area G.

Midway through the meeting, activists in the audience quietly began holding up placards with anti-nuclear and anti-laboratory slogans.

Public comment included technical questions about contents of the waste, concerns about DOE's plans to "cap and monitor" existing pits and questions about the thousand-year standard for projecting environmental impact.

Lydia Clark of Santa Fe pointed out that a recent court ruling had said 10,000 years was inadequate in the case of the proposed Yucca Mountain nuclear depository.

Another speaker, who did not identify himself, complained that the forum had been an exercise in narrowing perceptions.

"They want us to look through the keyhole and not focus on the big picture," he said. "It's not only waste. That which produced it is also deadly."
The U.S. Department of Energy is conducting an environmental impact analysis of the Los Alamos National Laboratory in preparation for the intended doubling of maximum plutonium pit production.

News of the planned production increase comes as the usefulness of the lab was called into question on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives Thursday, and former Laboratory Director Peter Nanos announced his resignation Friday.

Plutonium pits serve as triggers in modern thermonuclear weapons.

Elizabeth Withers, environmental compliance manager at the laboratory for the DOE, said the analysis was being undertaken so that the yearly maximum allowable production could be increased from 20 pits to 40. The 20-pit quota was set after a 1999 environmental impact analysis. In reality, the lab has only been producing one to two pits a year, she said.

The federal government has been trying to increase production of plutonium pits since the Rocky Flats facility outside Denver shut down in 1989. In the mid-'90s, Los Alamos National Laboratory resumed pit production for the first time since Rocky Flats construction in the '50s.

Los Alamos National Laboratory has taken on the responsibility of developing the pits since Congress cut funding for a proposed stand-alone pit production facility in 2004.

"We're looking at providing an interim capability here at Los Alamos," Withers said. "Of course all of these things take time. A new facility would not be operational for about another 20 years. So in that interim time period, we need to make some provisions within the department to make pits as needed."

The University of California currently manages lab operations at Los Alamos, and the UT System is considering a bid to take over control.

"My guess is that if, and this is a big if, the University of Texas participates in the bid for Los Alamos, it will be to oversee primarily the quality and integrity of the science that is done rather than managing the specific operations within the lab," said Juan Sanchez, vice president for research and member of the UT task force on Los Alamos.

University and nuclear watch groups oppose the increase in nuclear bomb materials.

Greg Mello, executive director and secretary of the Los Alamos Study Group, a private nuclear proliferation research organization, said pit production is harmful to the environment and that the laboratory is "opening a very big can of worms" by increasing it.

"This is analogous to the American revolution when the Red Coats actually appear," Mello said. "This is the Paul Revere moment for Los Alamos, as far as its future identity ... What is Los Alamos? That's the question that is being asked anew, and it's hard to know how long the process will go on, but it's being asked with earnestness we haven't seen before."

John Pruett, spokesman for UT Watch, said that if the University bid for and won the Los Alamos contract, the University would be associated with weapons production.

"Nuclear war is increased by production of nuclear weapons," said Pruett, a history senior. "If UT was going to get involved with that, we'd be at the front of a new nuclear arms race."


"We have a lab here that is a constant problem," Stupak said, according to the AP. "Is there any really unique science that can only be done there? Why do we need Los Alamos?"

Referring to the representative's comments, Sanchez said, "My opinion is as long as we are going to keep a nuclear weapons program, we need Los Alamos."
Los Alamos head resigns after 2 years  
By Zachary Warmbrodt

Los Alamos National Laboratory Director Peter Nanos announced his resignation Friday, ending a two-year tenure during which he shut down the laboratory amidst security lapses and some say created a wedge between lab management and scientists.

The University of California announced the appointment Friday of interim director Robert W. Kuckuck. Kuckuck, who worked for 35 years at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, is expected to serve as director until UC's current contract to manage Los Alamos expires.

Nanos, a retired vice admiral of the Navy, will take a position with the U.S. Department of Defense's Defense Threat Reduction Agency.

UC has not made a decision regarding the future bidding of Los Alamos but is preparing for competition, said UC spokesman Chris Harrington.

Juan Sanchez, vice president for research and member of the UT task force on Los Alamos, said the resignation has a negative impact on UC's possible bid.

"It doesn't help to have a change in the director this close to the recompetition," Sanchez said.

Roy Schwitters, chair of the UT physics department, said he doubts the resignation will affect the competition of the lab, which he said "has been through the ringer."

"I really think that the recompetition and the issues that are swirling around this have their origins long before Pete Nanos even came to the lab," Schwitters said. "They're a larger national issue that is important, and I would describe it as a general breakdown of trust between the technical community and the government oversight and the Congress."

Some of the lab's scientists have been voicing their criticisms of Nanos publicly in the last year. Nanos shut down most of the laboratory last July after computer disks went missing and a woman's eye was severely burned by a laser.

"We have all overcome a tremendous amount of adversity," Nanos said in a written statement to Los Alamos employees. "Issues with our business systems, security and safety forced all of us to take an inward look at how we do our jobs."

Douglas Roberts, a Los Alamos computer scientist who grew up at the lab and has worked there for more than two decades, has run the "LANL: The Real Story" Web log since December 2004 and estimates that 200-to-500 employees may post on the site, which prides itself on its anonymity.

Roberts said he would characterize the response to Nanos' resignation as falling into two categories: celebration and a readiness to move forward.

Greg Mello, director of the Los Alamos Study Group, a private group that studies nuclear proliferation, said Nanos angered "prima donna" weapons designers by trying to address the "very real" culture of corruption at Los Alamos.

"The University of Texas should be quite aware that this is not a figment of Nanos' imagination," Mello said. "This is real. He was trying to address that the best he could ... He did that in a Navy-like manner, but there was a lot of push-back from the scientists who really don't want to give up their ideas about themselves or their cherished freedoms."
When asked about the pit production and Stupak's comments, the UT System declined to comment.
Most of the world supports disarmament, but U.S. stonewalling casts a large shadow

By Greg Mello 9/11/05

NEW YORK — Here at the United Nations, representatives from 188 countries — which are signatories to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty — gathered to review the treaty’s operation.

In addition to the governmental delegations, about 2,000 representatives from about 50 nongovernmental organizations were also present last week, making this the largest gathering of disarmament and nonproliferation experts and activists in many years.

Among those who came to learn and to teach, to network and to strategize together were nine of us from the Los Alamos Study Group.

Mayors for Peace, a nuclear disarmament organization led by Mayors Akiba of Hiroshima and Itoh of Nagasaki, brought about 100 city mayors and their representatives out of the more than 1,000 mayors who belong to their organization.

We were all here because the treaty, and with it the world’s nonproliferation regime, is in trouble. Iran’s concealment of uranium enrichment activities was an issue, as was North Korea’s withdrawal from the treaty for the purpose of developing nuclear arms.

However, a deeper issue that threw a darker shadow over these proceedings was the question of the United States’ own compliance with the treaty’s nuclear disarmament requirement.

In the Bush administration, long-standing U.S. noncompliance is for the first time accompanied by what amounts to a cynical denial that compliance is even necessary. Instead of disarmament, new nuclear weapons and new factories to make them are a central part of this administration’s plan.

It is this stark disregard for the rule of law by the world’s most powerful country that threw everything here into question. In fact, U.S. stonewalling was the primary reason this important treaty conference opened without even an agenda.

When the conference opened, the United States had signaled its perfect willingness to conclude deliberations without any product. This is perversely realistic, because the U.S. positions do indeed make any constructive outcome impossible.

This central treaty cannot be strengthened while the United States remains unwilling to offer even a single step toward nuclear disarmament, a binding treaty requirement.

Diplomatically, the U.S. approach was a nonstarter, and the State Department knew it. It simply is not possible to argue successfully for strengthening the treaty — the cornerstone of the world’s nonproliferation regime — while we insist on breaking it.

Furthermore, key steps that would lay the groundwork to prevent proliferation are bizarrely unacceptable to the United States, including a moratorium on new uranium enrichment plants (like the ones proposed for Eunice, N.M., and Tehran, Iran), and ratification of a universal ban on nuclear testing.

All parties agreed the treaty has worked fairly well over its 35 years. In the treaty, all but five countries (the United States, Russia, China, France and the United Kingdom) agreed never to acquire nuclear weapons, and these five countries agreed to negotiate and conclude the process of complete nuclear disarmament.

In other words, 183 countries have agreed that possession of nuclear weapons is not legal — now and forever for 183 countries and eventually for the other five.

In 1996 the International Court of Justice, the United Nations’ judicial body, studied this commitment carefully at the request of the General Assembly and unanimously found there is a binding legal obligation for complete nuclear disarmament.

Interestingly, the court did not limit this obligation to treaty signatories, suggesting there is a universal legal and moral norm against the possession of nuclear weapons.

Only three countries never agreed to the treaty bargain: India, which said the treaty would legitimate an apartheid nuclear regime (so far, it is correct); Pakistan, which feels threatened by India’s nuclear weapons; and Israel, whose quite substantial nuclear arsenal has already created a nuclearized Middle East.

Of the many ironies here, one bears special mention: New Mexico’s role in nuclear weapons. Looking at the headlines in newspapers around the world, and talking to other representatives, it is quite clear people in other countries know exactly what is happening in New Mexico’s nuclear laboratories. People in New Mexico, however, do not. We live in denial, a cousin to despair, and our state’s institutions and political aspirations show it.

The good news is that a growing number of people around the world are standing up against the institutionalized apocalyptic violence embodied in nuclear weapons. There were no voices of despair here, only commitment, solidarity and hope.

For the first time since the 1980s, it’s beginning to look like a movement.
Anxiously, Los Alamos Awaits a New Era

By WILLIAM J. BROAD

Two of the world's largest military contractors are challenging the nation's largest university system for the job of running Los Alamos, the government's pre-eminent nuclear arms laboratory. The winner will preside over a program valued as high as $44 billion over two decades.

The issue is whether the University of California, the lab's longtime manager, should be awarded a new federal contract after presiding over years of safety problems, security lapses, financial irregularities and embarrassing scandals, culminating May 6 in the resignation of the director, Dr. G. Peter Nanos.

On a deeper level, the struggle is over Los Alamos's mission - whether it should turn away from its traditional role as a center of scientific excellence toward a narrower one focused on weapons design and production, in essence a bomb factory.

The university's history of automatic contract renewals ends in September; the Department of Energy says it will start receiving new proposals this week. Already, the lab is experiencing a wave of jitters, with retirements up sharply and officials expressing fears of a mass exodus.

The military contractors, Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman, are pursuing the contract separately. Their ambitions appear to align with those of the Bush administration, which wants Los Alamos to make atomic triggers for hydrogen bombs and a new generation of reliable, long-lived warheads.

The companies say they could revitalize Los Alamos as well. Dr. C. Paul Robinson, who recently resigned as director of the Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque to lead Lockheed Martin's bid for Los Alamos, said his company knew how to excel at industrial production without endangering its scientific mission.

"We don't want to devalue the role of science and technology," he said in an interview. "That's what drives the innovations."

But officials and experts both inside and outside Los Alamos say they worry that putting the lab in industrial hands may accelerate an exodus of vital personnel, diminish its ability to do world-class science and leave it poorly equipped to carry out the Bush administration's plans as well as its traditional responsibilities.

"I'm not sure that turning Los Alamos into a lackluster lab more focused on manufacturing is a good thing for the country," said Dr. Hugh Gusterson, an analyst at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology who studies the nation's nuclear arms laboratories. "If you're trying to recruit a young Ph.D. from Princeton, and you tell them you're working for the University of California and not a bomb shop, it really matters."

Dr. Gusterson, who visited Los Alamos last month, said he had never seen morale so low. "People were just stricken," he said. "They're worried that Los Alamos will increasingly become a manufacturing facility. A lot of people were talking about early retirement."

A main worry of lab employees is that new management will never match the university's benefits, including its generous pension plan. Kevin Roark, a spokesman for Los Alamos, said worries over such matters had contributed to a recent increase in retirement inquiries.

"These are core people," he said, adding that most of them were not support staff but experts involved centrally in work on nuclear arms or on halting their spread.

Isolated in the mountains of New Mexico, the Los Alamos National Laboratory employs 14,000 people on an annual budget of $2.2 billion. Nuclear weapons research is only one of its missions; it is ranked as one of the world's top laboratories in
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Anxiously, Los Alamos Awaits a New Era

By WILLIAM J. BROAD

Two of the world's largest military contractors are challenging the nation's largest university system for the job of running Los Alamos, the government's pre-eminent nuclear arms laboratory. The winner will preside over a program valued as high as $44 billion over two decades.

The issue is whether the University of California, the lab's longtime manager, should be awarded a new federal contract after presiding over years of safety problems, security lapses, financial irregularities and embarrassing scandals, culminating May 6 in the resignation of the director, Dr. G. Peter Nanos.

On a deeper level, the struggle is over Los Alamos's mission - whether it should turn away from its traditional role as a center of scientific excellence toward a narrower one focused on weapons design and production, in essence a bomb factory.

The university's history of automatic contract renewals ends in September; the Department of Energy says it will start receiving new proposals this week. Already, the lab is experiencing a wave of jitters, with retirements up sharply and officials expressing fears of a mass exodus.

The military contractors, Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman, are pursuing the contract separately. Their ambitions appear to align with those of the Bush administration, which wants Los Alamos to make atomic triggers for hydrogen bombs and a new generation of reliable, long-lived warheads.

The companies say they could revitalize Los Alamos as well. Dr. C. Paul Robinson, who recently resigned as director of the Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque to lead Lockheed Martin's bid for Los Alamos, said his company knew how to excel at industrial production without endangering its scientific mission.

"We don't want to devalue the role of science and technology," he said in an interview. "That's what drives the innovations."

But officials and experts both inside and outside Los Alamos say they worry that putting the lab in industrial hands may accelerate an exodus of vital personnel, diminish its ability to do world-class science and leave it poorly equipped to carry out the Bush administration's plans as well as its traditional responsibilities.

"I'm not sure that turning Los Alamos into a lackluster lab more focused on manufacturing is a good thing for the country," said Dr. Hugh Gusterson, an analyst at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology who studies the nation's nuclear arms laboratories. "If you're trying to recruit a young Ph.D. from Princeton, and you tell them you're working for the University of California and not a bomb shop, it really matters."

Dr. Gusterson, who visited Los Alamos last month, said he had never seen morale so low. "People were just stricken," he said. "They're worried that Los Alamos will increasingly become a manufacturing facility. A lot of people were talking about early retirement."

A main worry of lab employees is that new management will never match the university's benefits, including its generous pension plan. Kevin Roark, a spokesman for Los Alamos, said worries over such matters had contributed to a recent increase in retirement inquiries.

"These are core people," he said, adding that most of them were not support staff but experts involved centrally in work on nuclear arms or on halting their spread.

Isolated in the mountains of New Mexico, the Los Alamos National Laboratory employs 14,000 people on an annual budget of $2.2 billion. Nuclear weapons research is only one of its missions; it is ranked as one of the world's top laboratories in
terms of the number and quality of its unclassified scientific papers, as measured by how often subsequent papers cite them. Los Alamos has long maintained that the high quality of its science lifts its other endeavors.

The University of California's role goes back to 1943, when J. Robert Oppenheimer, then a top physicist there, founded the lab and brought along his employer. Historians say the university took on the management job reluctantly, mainly as a wartime public service.

The academic tie helped recruit the geniuses who built the first atom bomb but also brought a conundrum that endures today: the best civilian brains are capable of distinctly nonmilitary behavior. At wartime Los Alamos, Richard Feynman, later a Nobel laureate, spent a fair amount of time irritating the military authorities by cracking their safes.

Admirers say the climate of academic freedom lets dissenters speak out and gives the best and brightest minds a chance to clash; in science, sharp criticism is the backbone of rigor. But critics say the university's hands-off management style - especially after the cold war, when the central focus of the labors shifted from innovating to caretaking - resulted in a run of awkward and sometimes dangerous lapses.

"They lent their name and credentials for recruiting but were not in the day-to-day operations," said a senior Los Alamos official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity, saying he feared reprisal. Part of the problem, he said, was that the university got only $8 million a year for its work. In the new contract, he said, the figure is to climb to around $100 million, the higher pay coinciding with tougher management duties.

The biggest upset on the university's watch involved Dr. Wen Ho Lee, a Los Alamos scientist arrested in 1999 on 59 counts of mishandling secret data. All but one of the charges were dropped after a judge found significant problems with the government's case.

Apprehension about security increased in 2000 when two computer hard drives containing secret data vanished from a safe and were found weeks later behind a copying machine.

In 2002, the Energy Department said such jolts reflected a "systematic management failure," and in April 2003 it announced plans to end automatic contract renewals and open the pact to competition.

Now, two years later, the department says it will lay out the new contract's terms and expectations in a final request for proposals this week. Competitors will have 60 days to submit their bids. The management fee will be the same no matter who wins.

A career civil servant at the Energy Department, as yet unnamed, is to make the choice; the idea is to remove the risk of pressure that a political appointee may face.

"The future of the lab is up in the air right now," said Greg Mello, director of the Los Alamos Study Group, a private arms-control organization in Albuquerque that monitors weapons laboratories. "The question is how hard core Los Alamos is going to be, how much science and how much production."

On Wednesday, Bechtel, the world's largest construction and engineering company, said it would join the University of California's bid. Before that announcement, S. Robert Foley, a retired admiral who oversees the university's weapons lab management, said in an interview that adding a large industrial partner would "back up the capabilities on the business side to match what we have on the science side."

He acknowledged a history of management errors and weakness at the university, the lab and the government. "They played musical chairs," he said. "They didn't hold people accountable. So there is plenty of blame to go around."

If Lockheed Martin wins the bidding, Dr. Robinson, formerly of Sandia, will become the new Los Alamos director. The company is also talking to the University of Texas - the nation's second biggest university system - to see if it will join as an academic partner.

Northrop Grumman says its strong suit is its expertise in developing advanced technology and managing large-scale military programs. "Northrop Grumman's strength lies in its people - scientists and engineers much like those at Los Alamos - who
apply their energy and creativity to solve the nation's most challenging problems,' the company's president, Dr. Ronald D. Sugar, said in a statement.

But Dr. Gusterson of M.I.T. said the government needed to move carefully lest it cripple what has been a giant of national security.

"I'm sure it's attractive to have a tightly run ship," he said. "But you'll get worse science."
Scars, cancer and bad memories constantly remind Shigeko Sasamori of World War II.

At age 13, she was cleaning the streets of Hiroshima, Japan, when she heard an airplane, then felt a blast. Her fingers melted together, her nose disappeared, and her body was marked with burns from the radiation.

Sasamori is a survivor of the nuclear bomb, which was designed at Los Alamos and dropped on Hiroshima on Aug. 6, 1945.

American writer and activist Norman Cousins, whom Sasamori met at church, took pity on her and 25 other girls. He arranged for them to be sent to Mount Zion Hospital in New York City. After two years of skin grafts and cosmetic surgeries, the women went from looking monstrous to looking normal.

Sasamori decided to become a nurse. She spent her career in American hospitals. Now retired, she has become an activist against nuclear weapons and visited war-torn countries to comfort to the victims.

Next month, she will share her story in Santa Fe and Albuquerque. Though she still suffers from physical ailments, she feels this is her time to testify, to heal and to help create a world free from nuclear weapons.

If you go ...

What: Shigeko Sasamori, a nurse and atomic-bomb survivor, will tell her story three times in Santa Fe.

When: 7 p.m., June 10; 5:30 p.m. June 15; 7 p.m. June 17

Where: Cloud Cliff Cafe and Artspace, 1805 Second St.; Upaya Center, 1404 Cerro Gordo Road; Cloud Cliff Cafe and Artspace

Sponsors: The Los Alamos Study Group, a disarmament nonprofit organization; Upaya Center and Cloud Cliff Cafe and Artspace.
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U.S. Nuclear First Strike Doctrine Is Operational

by Jeffrey Steinberg

The Bush Administration has quietly put into place contingency plans for the use of nuclear weapons in pre-emptive attacks on at least two countries—Iran and North Korea. Confirmation of the new "global strike" plan appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, May 15, in a column by William Arkin, a former Army Intelligence analyst. EIR has interviewed several senior U.S. intelligence officials, who have confirmed the essential features of Arkin's report. They link the accelerated drive to prepare for offensive nuclear strikes against Iran and North Korea to the failure of the U.S. invasion and occupation of Iraq, and the dismal results of the use of "shock and awe" massive conventional bombings against Afghanistan and Iraq.

The Afghanistan war of 2003 provided the U.S. Air Force with the opportunity to test, under live combat conditions, the conventional "bunker buster" mega-bombs, which were supposed to penetrate and take out deep-underground hardened targets. But one senior U.S. intelligence source told EIR that, when U.S. troops arrived to do damage assessments, they found that the Taliban and Al Qaeda mountain bunkers were still largely intact, after being hit with the bunker busters.

The sources further emphasized that "military strategists see our vulnerabilities, especially after Iraq," U.S. military doctrine, one source said, had previously presumed a capability to engage in two sustained conflicts in two different regions of the world. "Such engagements are no longer possible, as the Iraq occupation shows. So there is now a shift to a doctrine of quick wars. The alternative to this change was to have the U.S. status as the last global superpower exposed as a fraud." The source, who spoke on condition of anonymity, noted: "We have 150,000 U.S. troops and thousands of spies—the biggest spy contingent globally—and we can't identify the Iraqi insurgents.... There was a presumption that you could invade and occupy without engaging in any kind of nation-building. And that is an oxymoron."

The source cautioned that the Bush Administration's new global strike plans are premised on the "fantasy" that you can develop a limited nuclear weapons capability that will not radioactively contaminate the area and kill large numbers of people. His final indictment of the new Bush Administration pre-emptive nuclear war doctrine was that, ultimately, when you talk about targeting North Korea, which is the number one target for a possible Bush Administration pre-emptive nuclear strike, you are really talking about war with China.

CONPLAN 8022

The Arkin story in the May 15 Washington Post, which has been picked up by news outlets around the world, offered a chronology of the recent steps taken by Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, on the road to pre-emptive nuclear war. This updated a EIR timeline of the Bush-Cheney Administration's drive to pre-emptive nuclear war, which was published on March 7, 2003, and is reprinted below. That original story tagged John Bolton as a pivotal player in the drive to end a quarter-century American policy of no first nuclear strike against any non-nuclear power. It traced the origins of the pre-emptive nuclear war policy to the early 1990s and then-Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney, who launched a plan to include "mini-nukes" in the conventional arsenal.

Arkin's article continues the chronology from mid-2004: "Early last summer," Arkin wrote, "Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld approved a top secret 'Interim Global Strike Alert Order' directing the military to assume and maintain readiness to attack hostile countries that are developing weapons of mass destruction, specifically Iran and North Korea.... In the secret world of military planning, global strike has become the term of art to describe a specific pre-emptive attack. When military officials refer to global
strike, they stress its conventional elements. Surprisingly, however, global strike also includes a nuclear option, which runs counter to traditional U.S. notions about the defensive role of nuclear weapons."

Arkin traced the Global Strike schema to a January 2003 classified Presidential Directive, in which President Bush defined a "full-spectrum" global strike as "a capability to deliver rapid, extended range, precision kinetic (nuclear and conventional) and non-kinetic (elements of space and information operations) effects in support of theater and national objectives." Along the way, the Strategic Command (Stratcom), headquartered at Offutt Air Force Base in Omaha, Nebraska, which formerly had been exclusively responsible for America's nuclear weapons triad, was merged with the Space Command, and given responsibility for global operations involving both nuclear and conventional weapons.

Already, the September 2002 National Security Strategy of the United States, for the first time, had codified the doctrine of pre-emptive war, stating that the U.S. "must be prepared to stop rogue states and their terrorist clients before they are able to threaten or use weapons of mass destruction against the United States and our allies." Stratcom then established an interim global strike division, to devise plans by the end of 2002.

Arkin reported that "COMPLAN 8022-22 was completed in November 2003, putting in place for the first time a pre-emptive and offensive strike capability, against Iran and North Korea. In January 2004, [Admiral James O.] Ellis certified Stratcom's readiness for global strike to the Defense Secretary and the President."

Arkin warned that "This blurring of the nuclear/conventional line, wittingly or unwittingly, could heighten the risk that the nuclear option will be used." He then detailed elements of CONPLAN 8022, which could involve the use of nuclear bunker busters, to take out hardened command structures and WMD depots in Iran or North Korea. CONPLAN 8022 could be activated if the U.S. determined there was an imminent threat of a nuclear attack, or "for a more generic attack on an adversary's WMD infrastructure."

"The global strike plan," Arkin wrote, "holds the nuclear option in reserve if intelligence suggests an 'imminent' launch of an enemy nuclear strike on the United States or if there is a need to destroy hard-to-reach targets." COMPLAN 8022 does not envision "boots on the ground," he said, but combines precision weapons attacks with commando-style short-term operations, thus vastly reducing the time required to stage and launch an attack.

**Nuclear Bunker Busters Already Deployed?**

One of the most controversial issues arising from the new Bush-Cheney Global Strike plan effort surrounds the potential use of nuclear bunker busters. The Bush Administration has attempted, in every defense budget, to add funding for research and development of a new generation of mini-nuclear weapons. This year, Defense Secretary Rumsfeld has asked for more than $8 million to continue research on Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP) weapons.

On April 28, Rep. Ellen Tauscher (D-Calif.) issued a press release, citing a just-released government-mandated study on RNEPs by the National Research Council. The study debunked the fundamental premise of nuclear bunker busters: that they will penetrate so deep below the Earth's surface before detonating that there will be minimal radioactive fallout. Tauscher stated, "In this report, the National Research Council affirmed critical warnings about the deadly effects of nuclear fallout—both in risks posed to the local population and to troops—possibly American or allied forces .... In yesterday's study, they conclude: 'Current experience and empirical predictions indicate that earth-penetrator weapons cannot penetrate to depths required for total containment of the effects of a nuclear explosion,' a sentiment voiced earlier this year by National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) head Linton Brooks."
Tauscher continued, "The report finds that the majority of deeply buried targets lie only 250 meters below the surface. These findings, coupled with the 'Sedan' tests conducted decades ago at the Nevada Test Site, clearly demonstrate that exploding nuclear 'bunker busters' would pose an incredible risk to civilians on the ground and in neighboring areas [with] 'casualties ranging from thousands to more than a million.' "

Beyond the issue of the persistent Bush-Cheney Administration push for more money for R&D on a new generation of bunker busters, it appears that bunker busters are already an integral part of the existing U.S. nuclear weapons arsenal. According to Greg Mello, the head of the Los Alamos Study Group, which closely monitors the U.S. nuclear weapons program, the Pentagon already has a deployable stockpile of B-61 "mod 11" bunker busters. The 1,200-pound bombs, which can be carried on B-2A Stealth bombers and even F-16 fighter jets, had been developed as a "modification" of existing bunker busters, replacing the older B-53 8,900-pound, 9-megaton "City Busters." By claiming that there were no new physical principles introduced with the B-61 "mod 11," the Pentagon sidestepped the Spratt-Furse attachment to the FY 1994 Defense Appropriation Bill, which banned any R&D on low-yield nuclear weapons (under 5 kilotons). The B-61 "mod 11" can carry a nuclear bomb with a payload as small as 300 tons.

Rumsfeld Lets It All Hang Out

So as to remove any ambiguity from the Bush-Cheney nuclear madness, on March 15, 2005, the Pentagon placed on its public website a draft version of Joint Publication 3-12, "Doctrine for Joint Nuclear Operations." This 69-page report made clear that the Bush Administration has fully integrated nuclear weapons into the conventional war-fighting. The Executive Summary stated: "For many contingencies, existing and emerging conventional capabilities will meet anticipated requirements; however, some contingencies will remain where the most appropriate response may include the use of U.S. nuclear weapons. Integrating conventional and nuclear attacks will ensure the most efficient use of force and provide U.S. leaders with a broader range of strike options to address immediate contingencies. Integration of conventional and nuclear forces is therefore crucial to the success of any comprehensive strategy."

Elsewhere in the Executive Summary, it was declared, "The U.S. does not make positive statements defining the circumstances under which it would use nuclear weapons. Maintaining U.S. ambiguity about when it would use nuclear weapons helps create doubt in the minds of potential adversaries, deterring them from taking hostile action."

For 25 years, up to the inauguration of George W. Bush, U.S. policy was that there would be no American first-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear armed states. George Shultz, Dick Cheney, John Bolton and company have fulfilled their impulse to hold the world hostage to unilateral nuclear weapons use in the hands of a President who shows increasing signs of madness.
Mystery of the nuclear whistleblower

A vicious assault on an ex-employee of the Los Alamos weapons lab is the latest in a series of unsolved incidents

Mark Townsend in New York
Sunday June 12, 2005

Observer

It had been the worst of blind dates; the no-show. Eventually, just before 2am, Tommy Hook conceded defeat and slunk away from the gaudy strip bar. As he traipsed across the neon-bathed parking lot of Cheeks nightclub, he would have wondered what became of his non-committal partner.

Hours earlier Hook, 52, had received a call from a fellow employee at the Los Alamos National Laboratory imploring him to head to the Santa Fe nightspot and hover by the bar. An excited, hushed voice had promised to corroborate Hook's explosive findings into massive financial irregularities at the birthplace of the nuclear bomb and proposed site for the Bush administration's new generation of atomic weapons.

Instead it is the brutal events that followed Hook's short walk that have plunged the top secret home of the US weapons project into fresh controversy.

The attack was ferocious; a group of up to six men stamped on the head of Hook, a former internal auditor at Los Alamos, with such intensity that footprint marks were still visible on his swollen face days later. A witness claimed that without the intervention of the club's bouncer, Hook would have been murdered. His wife Susan later alleged that the assailants told her husband during the beating that 'if you know what's good for you, you'll keep your mouth shut'.

The attack last week came 48 hours before US government investigators were scheduled to arrive at Hook's home and scrutinise audits detailing financial irregularities amounting to millions of taxpayer dollars at the New Texas laboratory. Now he has been silenced.

His shattered jaw remained wired shut throughout his 30th wedding anniversary on Friday. The incident at Cheeks has reopened a trail of unsolved murders, harassment and ongoing death threats that continues to plague America's controversial nuclear weapons programme.

The Observer has tracked down former whistleblowers and US congressional investigators who claim that people are risking serious harm by exposing flaws in the US atomic project at a time when the Bush administration is intent on resuming nuclear weapons production for the first time in 15 years. The attack has even wider ramifications, coinciding with new evidence revealing Britain's close involvement with the Los Alamos laboratory.

Peter Stockton spent last Thursday scrutinising the Cheeks car park for clues. Claims of a row over a parking accident and an altercation at the bar were soon dismissed. Neither Hook's wallet nor his red Subaru sedan was stolen. Stockton, a former congressional investigator, was deeply troubled by the similarities of the Hook beating and a case that has haunted him for almost 30 years.
In 1974, he investigated the death of Karen Silkwood, the nuclear company employee who died in an unexplained one-car crash many suspect was deliberately caused by her employers. Having spent months gathering evidence of corruption and contamination at the Kerr McGee site, Silkwood drove to meet a New York Times journalist with the proof. She never arrived. Subsequent investigations found that tracks were consistent with her car being forced off the road. The evidence that Silkwood was carrying with her has never been found. Her story became a Hollywood movie.

Hook too, was about to expose allegations of misconduct against the powerful nuclear lobby. He had been scheduled to testify before the House Energy and Commerce Committee this month on his allegations. A first meeting with government investigators was arranged for last Wednesday.

Stockton said that the public's largely favourable reaction to the recent unveiling of Deep Throat's identity in the Watergate affair was unusual. 'Whistleblowers have been harassed or fired. It is still a dangerous game, particularly in the nuclear sector', he told The Observer.

Greg Mello, who has been leading the Los Alamos Study Group for 13 years, has observed the mood in the remote outpost turning increasingly belligerent against those prepared to speak out about goings-on at the laboratory. 'A lot of people have been threatened, including myself,' he said. 'Los Alamos used to be full of liberal scientists, it was predominantly democratic with a lot of partying. Now it is very conservative. People feel that if you take a swipe at the labs you are taking a swipe at them.'

One Los Alamos employee created a political storm recently after being sacked for exposing large-scale theft at the lab. That followed the unsolved death in 1999 of Lee Scott Hall who had uncovered a serious flaw in the troubled £700m weapons testing programme at the Lawrence Livermore laboratories, close ally of its Los Alamos counterpart. The 54-year-old had been stabbed 10 times in his bedroom. No motive was established for the murder nor was anything stolen from his home. No one was ever arrested.

This weekend allies of Hook will continue wondering how his attackers remain at large. However, no allegations have been forwarded that anyone connected with the laboratory or the US nuclear programme ordered a hit on Hook. A spokesman for the lab denounced the beating as 'senseless and brutal'.

Whoever was responsible, indications suggest that Hook remains intent on testifying. His evidence threatens not only to embarrass the White House, but ultimately Whitehall as well.
Museum fund-raiser energizes both sides of nuclear debate

By Megan Arredondo
Tribune Reporter
July 13, 2005

If Ben Diven ever wanted to write a book about his experience with the Manhattan Project, he could literally start it with, "It was a dark and stormy night."

Diven, 86, was one of several scientists who spent hours testing the first atomic bomb 60 years ago this week.

"The day we shot (the bomb), the weather was bad. There was thunder and lightning going on," the Los Alamos man recalled.

Sixty years later, Diven is still not sure whether the atomic bomb was a change for the good or the bad.

On Friday, that debate will be brought to the forefront at a fund-raiser hosted by the National Atomic Museum, which will be attended by people who worked on the Manhattan Project and members of the Los Alamos Study Group - an organization opposed to nuclear weapons and nuclear energy.

With Saturday marking the 60th anniversary of the first atomic bomb test at Trinity site - a day some say changed the course of the world - the fund-raiser features a dinner, 1940s-style fashion show, and a panel discussion featuring some of those who were involved with the Manhattan Project.

Those who buy tickets - at $125 per person - will take a tour of the site at the White Sands Missile Range and dine at the Owl Caf? just as scientists did back in 1945.

"We thought it would be a fun fund-raiser," coordinator Kara Hayes said. "We thought it would be interesting to have people feel like they were part of the Manhattan Project."

But not everyone embraces the anniversary.

"We were somewhat appalled that such a serious subject would be treated as a parody," said Greg Mello, executive director of the Los Alamos Study Group. "The events they are celebrating resulted in the death of at least a quarter of a million people."

Three members of the group bought tickets and will attend, along with Shigeko Sasamori, a survivor of the Hiroshima bombing.

"We understand that there will be some discussion and we certainly plan to be a part of that," Mello said.

The museum is aware of the group's planned attendance and has no problem with it, Director Jim Walther said.

"It's an event that changed our world," Walther said. "People feel different about it one way or another."

Walther said the museum does not take sides on nuclear issues. "Our role is to inform people," he said.

With money raised from Friday's event, the museum will run a "Peace Day" exhibit Aug. 6 to mark the dropping of the bomb at Hiroshima, Walther said.
C. Paul Robinson, who recently retired as director of Sandia National Laboratories, said the world's first nuclear explosion on that July day 60 years ago made the world a less aggressive place to live in.

"The second World War cost the lives of 45 million people, but it's important to note that since the Trinity explosion, we've had no other world wars," Robinson said. "It's my belief that we may have put the fear in people that the world cannot allow that kind of mass slaughter again."

The goal of the U.S. nuclear weapons complex is not to use the country's weapons on other people but "to make people so fearful of the consequences of aggression that it stops that aggression altogether," Robinson said.

Diven, who won't attend the museum's event, said the goal of his work at Trinity was to bring an end to World War II, which it did.

"I don't see what good protesting does," he said. "We're going to have nuclear energy anyway. I would just urge people to advocate for the development of a safe way to harness that energy."

That night 60 years ago, Diven remembered tensions growing as scientists watched the weather, afraid lightening would strike the bomb.

"Up until minutes before, we didn't know when it was going to go off," Diven said.

The weather began to clear. The countdown started.

Scientists wore welding glasses as history unfolded before their eyes.

"It was like the sun came out," Diven said. "It was a long time before the the shockwave hit, but it was obvious the bomb had worked."

Copyright 2005, The Albuquerque Tribune. All Rights Reserved.
3 Labs Rip U.S. Nuclear Complex

John Fleck Journal Staff Writer copyright 2005 Albuquerque Journal

Senate Unveils DOE Budget Today

The United States' current approach to maintaining its nuclear arsenal "looks increasingly unsustainable," according to an internal report by senior officials at the nation's three nuclear weapons labs.

The nuclear weapons program's future costs exceed the available budget, and the effort to maintain aging warheads is forcing the nation to retain a larger nuclear arsenal than would otherwise be needed, the report concludes.

Completed last month, the report's findings mirror in some respects those of a key House of Representatives subcommittee.

The House Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee issued a report last month calling for a sweeping reorganization of the U.S. nuclear weapons complex as part of its proposed 2006 Department of Energy budget.

The two reports set the stage for today's unveiling of the Senate's version of the DOE budget, written by Sen. Pete Domenici, R-N.M.

The outcome of the debate is critical to New Mexico, which is home to Sandia and Los Alamos national laboratories, two of the three U.S. nuclear weapons design laboratories. The federal government will spend an estimated $2.9 billion this year for nuclear weapons work in New Mexico, more than in any other state.

The House and lab reports both argue that it is no longer feasible to maintain the existing Cold War nuclear arsenal by nursing along old weapons, refurbishing aging parts when necessary.

The labs' report, written by a quartet of senior nuclear weapons scientists and endorsed by the weapons program chiefs of the three U.S. nuclear weapons laboratories, argues that continuing to maintain weapons is possible "only at significantly increasing cost."

The program, dubbed "Stockpile Stewardship" when it was established a decade ago, "merely preserve(s) nuclear weapons with out-dated technology and a ponderous and expensive enterprise required to support old technology," the labs' report concludes.

Because of resulting uncertainties about long-term weapons reliability, "the United States must retain a relatively large number of reserve weapons to ensure against contingencies," the lab scientists from Sandia, Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore national laboratories wrote -- spares in
case problems crop up in some of the primary stockpile weapons.

Official stockpile numbers are classified, but the independent Natural Resources Defense Council, an environmental and arms control group, estimates there are 5,300 nuclear weapons in the active U.S. stockpile and another 5,000 being held in reserve.

The House Subcommittee, led by Rep. David Hobson, R-Ohio, raised similar arguments last month, concluding that the nuclear weapons labs need to design a new "Reliable Replacement Warhead" that is easier to care for in the long run.

Hobson's 2006 budget report calls for the new warhead to be "designed for ease of manufacturing, maintenance, dismantlement and certification without nuclear testing."

To do that, Hobson's spending plan would:

* Reduce spending on refurbishment of current U.S. weapons;

* Increase spending on design efforts for the new Reliable Replacement Warhead;

* Reduce spending on preparations for possible future underground nuclear test blasts at the federal government's Nevada Test Site;

* Cut spending on nuclear weapons supercomputers, arguing that they have not lived up to their promise as a way of conducting virtual nuclear tests to maintain existing weapons;

* Eliminate funding for a new factory to build plutonium nuclear weapon cores; and

* Delay money for a new plutonium lab at Los Alamos until the weapons designers have a clearer picture of what the newly designed warhead requires.

Greg Mello, an arms control activist at the Albuquerque-based Los Alamos Study Group, called Hobson's vision of a new nuclear weapons program "sweeping."

Aides to Domenici declined comment, saying they preferred to wait until they released their own proposed version of the 2006 nuclear weapons budget.
Whopping Expansion at Los Alamos National Labs

June 14, 2005

By Jane Odin

Welcome to New Mexico

We invest in nuclear;
P-Pits are our specialty.
We invest in WMD;
We make 'em, ship 'em, store 'em.

Bombs are the name of the game.
Our politics are the same.
Tons of unburied nuke waste
Under tents in rusting drums.

Plutonium glows in the sun.
In the land of nuclear fun.

But there's very little security
At factories of nuclear purity.

Welcome to New Mexico.
Roll or bowl a P-pit
A penny a pitch.
Capitol of WMD, capital of WMD.
Introduction
LANL is permitted to burn 1,408 pounds yearly of depleted uranium (DU) in open pits. The amount is up from the May report of 528 pounds. But hopefully we have little danger of DU in Taos. The particles are so heavy they don’t blow the distance. Dispersion models find that the particles travel 50 meters. That’s the end of the good news, LANL is a bomb-making factory. The place is flowing with plutonium—from plutonium pits to unimaginable tons of high-level radioactive waste. And now the Department of Energy (DOE) is itching to expand into the world’s largest unregulated radioactive waste dump and create the Rocky Flats of tomorrow: a Modern Pit Facility.

Meanwhile, will the Taos Town Council sign the resolution supporting U.S. compliance with the treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and the closure of the LANL nuclear waste dump? Los Alamos Study Group says Town Council support is very important. The vote is scheduled for June 28, after a presentation by Erlinda Gonzales, Town Council member and member of LANL’s Citizen’s Advisory Board (CAB).

If the Council fails to support the resolution, it is a vote in favor of the war machine, high-level radioactive waste, proliferation of nuclear warheads, terrorist threats, radioactive pollution and a philosophy of no more tomorrows.

Area G
The DOE wants to expand the LANL nuclear waste dump (Area G) from 63 to 93 acres in fall ’05. Greg Mello, Director of Los Alamos Study Group, says this must be stopped. Why focus on Area G? Fire, terrorism, environmental pollution, disease and proliferation are obvious concerns. Area G is said to have 2.5 million drums under three feet of sand. It’s located on the regional aquifer that supplies water to Los Alamos, Santa Fe, Albuquerque and Pojoaque. Area G has never been licensed, regulated or permitted. Although the Attorney General says the site is operating illegally, neither Governor Bill Richardson, A.G. Patricia Madrid, nor the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) has acted to do anything about it. At least something should be done about the estimated 50,000 drums of plutonium waste under huge white nylon tents sitting on the mesa before expanding Area G.

A chemical engineer and past member of CAB says that in
'99, unidentified radioactive gas-filled canisters piled up near Area G. "They would puncture tiny holes in the canisters and draw samples for analysis in an attempt to determine the exact nature of the waste," according to the engineer, who wrote in an extensive CAB memo that LANL needed to deal with waste-management situations "liable to have a major environmental impact on the surrounding communities." For example, according to NMED reports, there is noticeable Tritium and Strontium 90 contamination of groundwater in Mortandad Canyon. It is generally known that this was dumped through a sewer outlet into the canyon.

Details of health concerns and other issues are found at the Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety website www.nuclearactive.org. Look at “New Mexico’s Right to Know: The Impact of LANL Operations on Public Health and the Environment.” You will learn the Centers for Disease Control has found “the soil surrounding LANL may contain 100 times more plutonium than was previously estimated.” That’s just for starters.

Another major problem, according to Greg Mello and the Wall Street Journal, is poor security. Mello stated at a HUB meeting in Taos that on a scale of 1-10, LANL security is a 3. John Fialka writes in the Wall Street Journal that Army special-forces teams have tested security at LANL several times and demonstrated that “quick attacks by small, well-trained teams can penetrate department security forces and gain access to simulated nuclear materials used in the exercises.”

**Rocky Flats Moves to LANL**
Currently, LANL is the only source of plutonium pits in the United States. These round, smooth grapefruit-sized pits are the trigger-explosive mechanism for W88 Poseidon submarine missiles. With Bush’s push to expand Star Wars nuclear capacity (“Bush’s New Nukes: Our Radioactive Future” in Earth Island Journal, Summer 2005) they need more than the 20 to 40 pits produced in LANL’s facility.

Pit production was brought down from the Rocky Flats nuclear weapons plant when the FBI closed it for polluting the Denver-Boulder area, after faulty equipment created fires that released plutonium into the atmosphere. It had to be a critical scenario for the FBI to take action. The site was so contaminated the buildings and facilities were decontaminated and removed brick by brick. They are still working on closure.
Guess what? According to an inside source, the DOE simply moved the Rocky Flats scientific personnel and pit-box equipment to LANL. Now LANL would like to win the government contract to build The Modern Pit Facility, capable of 450 pits per year, known as the new bomb factory.

The University of California stated in a letter to Hank Daneman in 1990 that plutonium production at LANL was a no-go. James Kane in the UC president's office stated, "the University has no intention of managing a plutonium production facility. Our contract calls for research only." Could this be an inside reason UC is out of the LANL management business?

Basically each pit is equal to a nuclear warhead. This is interesting, considering Article 6 of the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), signed by the U.S., calling for nuclear disarmament. Town Council member Erlinda Gonzales is expected to urge the Council on the 28th to vote against a resolution supporting compliance with NPT and closure of the waste site. Why is this expected? In the past, when the CAB-appointed by DOE/LANL—has not supported LANL, it was removed from service. It is an interesting history, as reported to Horse Fly by a past chairman of the CAB.

CAB History
The purpose of the CAB, as set forth in the Federal Advisory Committee Act, is to identify environmental concerns of the local public, develop recommendations to prevent environmental degradation and to accelerate cleanup of legacy wastes. But this is not what occurs. A former long-term chairman of the CAB wrote in 1999 that the CAB was downgraded from "an independently aggressive board into a submissive one willing to sit placidly through the 'dog and pony' shows staged by the DOE at the beginning of every board meeting." DOE removed one entire CAB after it criticized LANL safety and waste management. LANL brought in new candidates and changed the bylaws for the purpose of "keeping the CAB within bounds." The head of waste management quit because LANL was diverting money that was supposed to be going to waste management to other places. "LANL treated budget allocations as discretionary spending," according to the former CAB chairman.

A DOE rep at LANL told me prospective CAB members are checked out by the site office manager and that DOE in
Washington makes the final decisions on CAB membership. So it seems it would be most difficult to criticize “the boss” and keep the job for two years. I hope the Town Council keeps this in mind when listening to Gonzales’ presentation on the waste site. Taoseños should take a moment to let the Town Council and Mayor know how you feel about the resolution for nonproliferation and against nuke factories and radioactive waste storage in northern New Mexico.

**Conclusion: What You Can Do**

When Oppenheimer moved the Manhattan Project from Chicago to the boys’ school ranch at Los Alamos in ’42, the spot was chosen because of its total isolation. This is certainly not the case in 2005. Northern New Mexico is no longer the morally correct place to continue expansion of a whopping big radioactive waste site and P-pit facility. Also, plutonium pit production creates so much radioactive waste, it would make sense to move it closer to the WIPP (Waste Isolation Pilot Plant) in southeastern New Mexico.

On Aug. 6, the Los Alamos Study Group is sponsoring a Hiroshima commemoration celebration at Ashley Pond Park at Los Alamos, under the banner of “Stop the New Bomb Factory.” Call 505-265-1200 to volunteer. Food and lodging will be provided. This will be an exciting event with music, drama, poetry and teach-ins.

Diane Gledhill needs volunteers to sign up more local businesses to the Resolution. So far approximately 65 have signed. Contact her at 751-3016.

There are a number of northern New Mexico groups working to stop expansion at LANL:

- Nuclear Watch New Mexico, www.nukewatch.org (a wealth of timely documents on this website).
3 Labs Rip Nuclear Program

John Fleck Journal Staff Writer

* The report, and one by a House subcommittee, calls for wide-ranging changes

The United States' current approach to maintaining its nuclear arsenal "looks increasingly unsustainable," according to an internal report by senior officials at the nation's three nuclear weapons labs.

The nuclear weapons program's future costs exceed the available budget, and the effort to maintain aging warheads is forcing the nation to retain a larger nuclear arsenal than would otherwise be needed, the report concludes.

Completed last month, the report's findings mirror in some respects those of a key House of Representatives subcommittee.

The House Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee issued a report last month calling for a sweeping reorganization of the U.S. nuclear weapons complex as part of its proposed 2006 Department of Energy budget.

The two reports set the stage for today's unveiling of the Senate's version of the DOE budget, written by Sen. Pete Domenici, R-N.M.

The outcome of the debate is critical to New Mexico, which is home to Sandia and Los Alamos national laboratories, two of the three U.S. nuclear weapons design laboratories. The federal government will spend an estimated $2.9 billion this year for nuclear weapons work in New Mexico, more than in any other state.

The House and lab reports both argue that it is no longer feasible to maintain the existing Cold War nuclear arsenal by nursing along old weapons, refurbishing aging parts when necessary.

The labs' report, written by a quartet of senior nuclear weapons scientists and endorsed by the weapons program chiefs of the three U.S. nuclear weapons laboratories, argues that continuing to maintain weapons is possible "only at significantly increasing cost."

The program, dubbed "Stockpile Stewardship" when it was established a decade ago, "merely preserve(s) nuclear weapons with out-dated technology and a ponderous and expensive enterprise required to support old technology," the labs' report concludes.

Because of resulting uncertainties about long-term weapons reliability, "the United States must retain a relatively large number of reserve weapons to ensure against contingencies," the lab scientists from Sandia, Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore national laboratories wrote -- spares in case problems crop up in some of the primary stockpile weapons.

Official stockpile numbers are classified, but the independent Natural Resources Defense Council, an
environmental and arms control group, estimates there are 5,300 nuclear weapons in the active U.S. stockpile and another 5,000 being held in reserve.

The House subcommittee, led by Rep. David Hobson, R-Ohio, raised similar arguments last month, concluding that the nuclear weapons labs need to design a new "Reliable Replacement Warhead" that is easier to care for in the long run.

Hobson's 2006 budget report calls for the new warhead to be "designed for ease of manufacturing, maintenance, dismantlement and certification without nuclear testing."

To do that, Hobson's spending plan would:

* Reduce spending on refurbishment of current U.S. weapons;
* Increase spending on design efforts for the new Reliable Replacement Warhead;
* Reduce spending on preparations for possible future underground nuclear test blasts at the federal government's Nevada Test Site;
* Cut spending on nuclear weapons supercomputers, arguing that they have not lived up to their promise as a way of conducting virtual nuclear tests to maintain existing weapons;
* Eliminate funding for a new factory to build plutonium nuclear weapon cores; and
* Delay money for a new plutonium lab at Los Alamos until the weapons designers have a clearer picture of what the newly designed warhead requires.

Greg Mello, an arms control activist at the Albuquerque-based Los Alamos Study Group, called Hobson's vision of a new nuclear weapons program "sweeping."

Aides to Domenici declined comment, saying they preferred to wait until they released their own proposed version of the 2006 nuclear weapons budget.
Sprinkling Plutonium on Your Banana

July 15, 2005

By Jane Odin

Background
Back in the ’70s nuclear scientists chowed down on plutonium. The catchphrase of the day was “sprinkle some plutonium on your banana.” Sounds like a chachacha. In the ’40s and ’50s scientists forced plutonium on others. The Manhattan Project and Atomic Energy Commission injected unsuspecting hospital patients and prisoners with plutonium and learned how total body irradiation had radically different effects from individual to individual. (Read “The Plutonium Files” by Eileen Welsome.) Some died—some are alive today. Many of the experiments were conducted by Nazi scientists brought to the U.S. in Project Paperclip. The Nazi legacy of arrogant ruthlessness, deception, and cover-up is perpetuated today by the Department of Energy (DOE), as witnessed in their general philosophy and the management of nuclear proliferation sites across America, including Los Alamos National Lab (LANL).
As you know from the June Horse Fly, the DOE wants to expand the Area G nuclear waste site. Meanwhile, we’ve learned the New Mexico Environment Department (NMED) may issue a draft closure for the Area G nuclear waste site in February 2006. This development focuses magnified importance on supporting the nonproliferation resolution in front of the Taos Town Council.

**What’s Hidden in Area G?**

The Town Council postponed the June 28 vote on the nonproliferation resolution, pending study at a council workshop on July 12. The council is scheduled to vote on July 19. (All of this, as usual, is subject to change.) Town Councilor Gene Sanchez knows where he stands. He will be voting in favor of the resolution and against the expansion of the Area G waste site. DOE Citizen’s Advisory Board member and Town Councillor Erlinda Gonzales is expected to vote against the resolution. What else does one do when working for the DOE and LANL? At some point the council will view a DOE propaganda film on LANL.

What will the LANL film reveal? Will it point out the nuclear reactors buried under the sand at material disposal area TA 21? Nuclear reactors and spent fuel rods emit gamma rays, making it high-level radioactive waste. Will the film show Area C, where the super-hot waste is stored? And what about older sites—such as Areas A, B, T, and V—that date back to the Manhattan Project? No one knows what’s in these sites.

LANL and the DOE say there is no high-level waste at Area G. According to the Los Alamos Study Group (LASG) this isn’t the case. “LANL has routinely produced irradiated reactor fuel in its own reactors, of which there have been several since 1944, and this was buried at Area G and other Material Disposal Areas.” What about the drill-back cores from underground tests containing the same radioactive isotopes in similar concentrations as spent nuclear fuel? Apparently there is high-level waste and every other type of ionizing radiation at LANL.

The DOE told Greg Mello, director of LASG, that Area G cannot close because some of the waste streams are so highly radioactive there is no possible way to ship them off-site. For example, no container will hold super-hot carbon accelerator beam stops. Should we be surprised that DOE continues to claim there’s no high-level waste at LANL? Read about DOE’s philosophy of deception and cover-up in the Caron...

Irresponsible Management

Have you seen the large black plumes blowing into Taos from Los Alamos? Now we know they are beryllium plumes. At a blogspot known as LANL: The Real Story, LANL scientists discuss the April 2005 hydrotest at the Dual-Axis Radiographic Hydrotest (DARHT) facility, which evaluates munitions and studies high-velocity impact phenomena. Their comments say Taos Valley is affected: “The prevailing winds take the plumes from DARHT and PHERMEX (not decommissioned) directly over TA-3, the town site, and have been tracked all the way to the Taos Valley. The test Friday had a large black plume that followed the same path. The foam does concentrate more Be at Darht [sic] but a substantial portion is still released to the environment.”

When the plume first became an issue, Senator Pete Domenici was told the foam protection technique in use could only be 20 to 40 percent efficient in controlling the beryllium. “Pete’s response was that it didn’t matter if it worked as long as we were perceived to be doing something about the problem. He had no interest in the hazards as long as he looked good. And so in the end we got a much more hazardous work environment at DARHT and the public got a healthy dose of Be,” according to the Real Story blogspot.

A healthy dose of Be is known to produce Chronic Beryllium Disease (CBD). According to a blogspot entry, “There are a number of people that work at or around DARHT that have contacted CBD and they will die from it. The disease has no cure. The symptoms are much like emphysema and it is debilitating before it is fatal. This is the information they don’t want you to know.” The authorities say some people are much more susceptible to CBD than others. Onset of the disease is signaled by shortness of breath, fatigue, night sweats, and coughing.

Other comments on the LANL blogspot go like this: “Why does nobody understand how badly LANL has deteriorated and how terribly irresponsible the management has been?” “Safety, security and environmental problems ... all these are solvable if someone cares. It’s obvious that the bloated upper management at LANL doesn’t care.” “There are countless other examples of DOE’s lip-service regarding safety and security.”
What's Happening?

James Bearzi, Bureau Chief at NMED’s Hazardous Waste Department, says LANL will be compelled to close Area G by February ’06. Bearzi says the issue is not so much what they have in Area G but that LANL continues to use this site as they have in the past. He says the post-closure permit and scheduling of public hearings will be the beginning of an enormous fight whose success depends on citizen response at the public hearings. The DOE does not want Area G closed. According to Bearzi, “This will be the first time the state has played its hand.”

LASG Director Greg Mello says if the state moves to close the waste site it will definitely be the first time the state has played its hand. Mello has heard this promise on multiple occasions before. The waste site permit expired in ’89 but has been administratively continued by NMED. Mello says, “LANL is not now under any threat from NMED to close Area G nor will it be next year due to any RCRA [Resource Conservation & Recovery Act] process.” The last time Mello spoke to Bearzi, he was told that the “cleanup” order would be proposed by NMED and DOE for inclusion en bloc into the permit. So we have two contradictory stories coming out of NMED. Sounds like they’re sprinkling plutonium on our bananas again and again.

We have a unique opportunity in New Mexico to stand strong for peace in a country that is escalating weapons buildup and continuing the militarization of space. We have a unique opportunity because we are at the heart of the beast. If you want to know details of what is planned by the Department of Defense and the DOE for our future, check out a most important document on the Internet: “Rebuilding America’s Defenses: Strategies, Forces and Resources for a New Century.”

Contact Taos Town Council members and urge them to support the resolution against proliferation. And try to attend Hiroshima Day in Los Alamos on Aug. 6. LASG’s website (www.lasg.org) has all the details.
Panel OKs nuke studies

This is the second of two articles on the Senate Appropriations Committee's approval of a bill to fund the Department of Energy, including Los Alamos National Laboratory.

ROGER SNODGRASS 4/17/95
Monitor Assistant Editor

Senate appropriators, taking their lead from Sen. Pete Domenici, R-NM, approved two nuclear weapons initiatives on Thursday.

One of them, the “bunker buster,” or Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP), which is meant to detonate deeply under the surface to attack buried enemy targets, was missing from the House appropriation bill passed by the full House on May 25.

The other, the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW), was approved by both the House and the Senate Appropriations Committees, but with a somewhat different rationale in each case.

The House Armed Services Committee authorized the Pentagon's request for the bunker buster, but the House approved an appropriation bill without the funds for studying the weapon.

The Senate measure, which will be debated and decided by the full body later, calls for resuming a $4 million study of the bunker buster.

The RNEP research was halted when the balance of funding was applied to the RRW under a consolidated funding bill last year.

The House and Senate committee agreed on providing additional funding ($25 million) for the RRW program, conceived in Los Alamos for simplifying and economizing nuclear weapons production and maintenance without resumption of testing.

The Senate pane's energy package reflected Domenici's cautious approach to transformational claims made by proponents of the RRW, as advanced in a document known as the "Overskei report."

"This is the ninth such study commissioned since 1988," the Senate committee noted in the report accompanying the appropriations bill. "Previous studies have proposed a multitude of wide-ranging proposals, of which many were justifiably ignored." The Overskei report, a review of the nuclear weapons complex infrastructure, written by representatives of the three nuclear weapons laboratories, was commissioned by the House Energy and Water Development Appropriation Bill last year and was due April 30, 2005, although it has yet to be officially released.

A copy of the 10-page report, "Sustaining the Nuclear Enterprise," was obtained by the Monitor.

The thrust of the report continues themes that have been propounded by National Nuclear Security Administration Administrator Linton Brooks and Rep. David Hobson, R-Ohio, Domenici's counterpart, chair of the House Energy and Water appropriations subcommittee.

The Overskei Report, a copy of the 10-page report explicitly prohibits any use of funding to implement recommendations in the Overskei Report for this year.

"This provision will allow Congress to fully review these suggested changes," Domenici said in a statement Thursday.

Domenici agreed to explore the RRW concept, but his caution reflected concerns within the nuclear establishment that the challenge posed by reforming the existing system could backfire if it is oversold. Greg Mello of the Los Alamos Study Group, a public interest group based in Albuquerque, raised an issue in a recent e-mail:

"The 'stockpile stewardship' that the three weapons laboratories now find to be inadequate ('unsustainable' is the precise word, sustainability being the exact purpose of the program) is in the same plan they invented in 1994 over the technical objections of many former and independent scientists," he wrote. "The laboratories consistently have been quite upbeat about the stewardship program in testimony, and their budgets have risen substantially under its auspices."

In a related subject, the House continued to oppose additional funding for "test readiness," that would accelerate the nation's ability to conduct underground nuclear experiments at the Nevada Test Site, saying the RRW program "obviates any reason to move to a provocative 18-month test-readiness posture."

The House cut $10 million from the administration budget request.

The Senate committee funded the full $25 million request.

Differences between bills passed by the two houses are resolved through a conference process in negotiations between members selected from each house.

FUNDING Congress eyes projects
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"The 'stockpile stewardship' that the three weapons laboratories now find to be inadequate ('unsustainable' is the precise word, sustainability being the exact purpose of the program) is in the same plan they invented in 1994 over the technical objections of many former and independent scientists," he wrote. "The laboratories consistently have been quite upbeat about the stewardship program in testimony, and their budgets have risen substantially under its auspices."

In a related subject, the House continued to oppose additional funding for "test readiness," that would accelerate the nation's ability to conduct underground nuclear experiments at the Nevada Test Site, saying the RRW program "obviates any reason to move to a provocative 18-month test-readiness posture."

The House cut $10 million from the administration budget request.
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Differences between bills passed by the two houses are resolved through a conference process in negotiations between members selected from each house.
Shigeko Sasamori Comes to New Mexico Nearly 60 Years After the Atom Bomb Was Dropped on Her City of Hiroshima

By Heather Clark

ALBUQUERQUE—Shigeko Sasamori hopes her scarred body and gnarled fingers will put a human face on the suffering caused by the creation of the atomic bomb.

The 73-year-old grandmother was a 13-year-old school girl when she saw the nuclear bomb drop from the blue morning sky over Hiroshima on Aug. 6, 1945.

Sasamori traveled to New Mexico— the birthplace of the atomic bomb— on the 60th anniversary of the Trinity Test to ask scientists to stop nuclear warfare.

"I want to talk to their hearts and beg them not to do it," she said.

On that August morning in 1945, Sasamori said she and a friend were setting out to join a work crew that was going to clear a city street less than a mile from Ground Zero.

"I saw the airplane, and I saw the bomb drop," she said in an interview. "I told my schoolmate next to me, 'Look at the airplane, it's so beautiful.'"

Her 13-year-old friend was killed in the blast.

Sasamori then felt a force knock her to the ground.

"The next thing I knew, it's completely blacked out, like dead earth," she said. "I wasn't scared. I didn't have any feelings, emotions, nothing."

As she sat up, she saw gray shapes of people moving silently through the lifting fog. They were covered with gray and black ash, their hair was burned and their blistering and hanging skin was visible through tattered clothing.

"I saw that everybody looked so terrible, just like they came from hell," she said. "No one was talking, no one was screaming."

She believes now that she was in shock as she followed the crowd to the river to escape the burning city. The first sound she remembered was a screaming baby, whose injured mother was trying to nurse her child.

Five days later, Sasamori's mother, who had been searching the faces of the bodies that remained in the streets for her missing daughter, found Sasamori in a nearby school.

One-fourth of Sasamori's body was burned, her fingers were scorched to the bone and she had as many as 30 operations to repair the damage. Three years
ago, she underwent surgery for intestinal cancer and doctors now think she has thyroid cancer.

Sasamori was one of 25 "Hiroshima Maidens" brought to the United States for reconstructive surgery in 1955 by American editor and author Norman Cousins, who she describes as her adoptive father.

Eventually, Sasamori decided to settle in the United States, where she became a nurse.

Sasamori, who now lives in Marina del Rey, Calif., said she is not angry at Americans for how World War II ended, but rather hates war itself and is saddened by the actions of those who made the bomb.

But Sasamori was upset about an event at the National Atomic Museum in Albuquerque on Friday, which local anti-nuclear protesters called a celebration of the Trinity anniversary.

The museum advertised the $125-per-ticket event on its Web site as a chance to relive the drama, secrecy, excitement and awe of the Manhattan Project. Participants were given a secret identity at the door of the museum and were treated to food, a cash bar, a '40s fashion show, slides of the Trinity test and a panel discussion by historians and test participants. On Saturday, they were taken to the Trinity test site in southern New Mexico for a tour.

"Many people are dead. Those people's souls aren't happy. Why are you celebrating?" Sasamori said. "You are making a weapon to kill us. So, I feel that's not appropriate to celebrate."

A museum spokeswoman did not answer a voice mail message and no one answered several phone calls to the museum Friday.

On Aug. 6, Sasamori said she will mark the 60th anniversary of the bomb being dropped on Hiroshima with a more appropriate ceremony: a moment of silence in her home town to remember the dead.
Headline News

Panel OKs nuke studies

ROGER SNODGRASS, roger@lamonitor.com, Monitor Assistant Editor

This is the second of two articles on the Senate Appropriations Committee approval of a bill to fund the Department of Energy, including Los Alamos National Laboratory. Senate appropriators, taking their lead from Sen. Pete Domenici, R-NM, approved two nuclear weapons initiatives on Thursday.

One of them, the "bunker buster," or Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP), which is meant to detonate deeply under the surface to attack buried enemy targets, was missing from the House appropriation bill passed by the full House on May 25.

The other, the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW), was approved by both the House and the Senate Appropriations Committee but with a somewhat different rationale in each case.

The House Armed Services committee authorized the Pentagon's request for the bunker buster, but the House approved an appropriation bill without the funds for studying the weapon.

The Senate measure, which will be debated and decided by the full body later, calls for resuming a $4 million study of the bunker buster.

The RNEP research was halted when the balance of funding was applied to the RRW under a consolidated funding bill last year. The House and Senate committee agreed on providing additional funding ($25 million) for the RRW program, conceived in Los Alamos for simplifying and economizing nuclear weapons production and maintenance without resumption of testing.

The Senate panel's energy package reflected Domenici's cautious approach to transformational claims made by proponents of the RRW, as advanced in a document known as the "Overskei report."

"This is the ninth such study commissioned since 1988," the
Senate committee noted in the report accompanying the appropriations bill. "Previous studies have proposed a multitude of wide-ranging proposals, of which many were justifiably ignored."

The Overskei report, a review of the nuclear weapons complex infrastructure, written by representatives of the three nuclear weapons laboratories, was commissioned by the House Energy and Water Development Appropriation Bill last year and was due April 30, 2005, although it has yet to be officially released.

A copy of the 10-page report, "Sustaining the Nuclear Enterprise," was obtained by the Monitor.

The thrust of the report continues themes that have been propounded by National Nuclear Security Administration Administrator Linton Brooks and Rep. David Hobson, R-Ohio, Domenici's counterpart, chair of the House Energy and Water appropriations subcommittee.

The Overskei Report called for additional studies toward reforming and consolidating the nuclear weapons complex around the idea of the RRW as "the most viable path to the future."

The authors said that the present approach to nuclear stockpile stewardship, the process of maintaining and certifying a reliable reserve of nuclear weapons, "looks increasingly unsustainable."

"As these warheads continue to age and are refurbished, an accumulation of small changes could lead to increased risk or increased uncertainty in warhead certification," the report stated, calling for replacement warheads rather than refurbished warheads.

The Senate appropriations panel's report explicitly prohibits any use of funding to implement recommendations in the Overskei Report for this year.

"This provision will allow Congress to fully review these suggested changes," Domenici said in a statement Thursday.

Domenici agreed to explore the RRW concept, but his caution reflected concerns within the nuclear establishment that the challenge posed by reforming the existing system could backfire if it is oversold.

Greg Mello of the Los Alamos Study Group, a public interest group based in Albuquerque, raised an issue in a recent e-mail:

"The 'stockpile stewardship' that the three weapons laboratories now find to be inadequate ('unsustainable' is the
precise word, sustainability being the exact purpose of the program) is the same plan they invented in 1994 over the technical objections of many former and independent scientists," he wrote. "The laboratories consistently have been quite upbeat about the stewardship program in testimony, and their budgets have risen substantially under its auspices."

In a related subject, the House continued to oppose additional funding for "test readiness," that would accelerate the nation's ability to conduct underground nuclear experiments at the Nevada Test Site, saying the RRW program "obviates any reason to move to a provocative 18-month test-readiness posture."

The House cut $10 million from the administration budget request.

The Senate committee funded the full $25 million request.

Differences between bills passed by the two houses are resolved through a conference process in negotiations between members selected from each house.
TOWN GOVERNMENT

Angry citizens blast council

By Betsy Phillips
The Taos News

Taos has gained a reputation as a hotbed for political activism. With Los Alamos National Laboratories just 60 miles away, it was only a matter of time before local activists and the federal facility collided.

The expansion of Area G at LANL seems to be the trigger issue, for many. The normal peace and quiet of the town council chambers was shattered Tuesday night (July 19) by citizens asking for the council's approval of a resolution opposing nuclear proliferation and the expansion of Area G.

Those concerned with the issue were hoping the passage of the resolution could change, before the 40th anniversary of the Hiroshima bombing.

TOWN

Battle not yet over
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The bombing of Hiroshima by the United States at 8:15 a.m. on Aug. 6, 1945, killed 140,000 people, caused horrific injuries and deformities to survivors and serious collateral damage.

The Northern New Mexico Citizens' Advisory Board (NNM-CAB) Web site describes Area G as one of LANL's nuclear waste disposal areas. Located on the mesa of the Rio Grande along Pajarito Road, Area G is about 8 miles southeast of Los Alamos, but only one mile from White Rock.

In operation since 1957, Area G has 32 pits, which are typically 600 feet long and 30 feet deep; 194 shafts and four trenches of disposed wastes of various classifications from low-level waste to transuranic waste. Beginning as a 5-acre site in 1957, the disposal site has received more than 10.7 million cubic feet of radioactive waste and now stretches across 65 acres.

It was described Tuesday night as a tent city where they store nuclear waste above ground.

As the 2000 Cerro Grande Fire proved, the Taos area is downwind from any emissions that may come from the lab area.

The council for three months has had the request for a resolution to support compliance of the treaty on Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Two changes were requested in the original resolution that also opposes expansion of Area G.

Town Attorney Renée Barela-Gutierrez drafted the original resolution. After speaking to activist Diane Goddick in June, she added two provisions, stating opposition to Area G expansion.

John Acker of Peace Action Now told those gathered, "Vany was very strongly (about this issue) and ask that you support the citizens resolution.

Activist Cliff Bain told the council, "Thirty-five years ago the nonproliferation treaty passed — I don't think it's working. Your resolution gives lip service (to the concern) while ignoring the elephant in our state — LANL.

Jean Nichols told the council, "We can't continue to say we're the only ones allowed to have nuclear weapons. A green light for expansion of Area G is a green light for plutonium pits. We need to send a message — never again.

Joe Balsamo said, "As a member of the medical community for 35 years, I'm concerned about your health. I used to be concerned about smoking, but this issue is way bigger.

Business owner Marc Campbell came to the meeting to speak in favor of Destination Taos' marketing program, but he found a connection between the two issues. "Visit this town that glows in the dark," he said.

After all the citizens had a chance to be heard, councilwoman Erlinda Gonzales also spoke in favor of the resolution. "I want to keep our community safe. I ask the council to give us a little light for expansion of Area G is a green light for plutonium pits. We need to send a message — never again.

Sanchez made a motion to pass the amended resolution. After all the citizens had a chance to be heard, councilwoman Erlinda Gonzales also spoke in favor of the resolution. "I want to keep our community safe. I ask the council to give us a little light for expansion of Area G.

"Don't forget to vote, everyone," one person shouted.

"I don't know if these resolutions cover everything," Gonzales said. "I want to keep our community safe. I ask the community to give us a little time.

But that is just what the residents at the meeting felt the resolution would do. "This gives us an opportunity to start a dialogue," John Acker said.

Sánchez made a motion to pass the amended resolution, but it died for lack of a second.

This drew further expressions of disgust from the crowd. "Don't forget to vote, everyone," one person shouted.

After the meeting several people expressed the opinion that Gonzales is "on the other side." Still others said they were "disappointed but not shocked."

On the 60th anniversary of the Hiroshima bombing, some said they were "underwhelmed." But others said they were "disappointed but not shocked."

On the 60th anniversary of the Hiroshima bombing, some said they were "underwhelmed." But others said they were "disappointed but not shocked."

Gonzales found the council's refusal to pass the resolution ironic: "What the resolution says is that we're against expansion and it needs study."
Board Says Labs Need a Lot of Work

Fire protection at Los Alamos National Laboratory is not what it ought to be, according to a recent government report that cites both LANL and the U.S. Department of Energy for failing to implement fixes for long-standing problems.

Issued as an April 29 memo by the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, which oversees safety at the nation's nuclear research facilities, the report recognizes significant improvements in fire protection and safety at LANL, but notes that efforts to amend shortcomings have not been a priority and numerous problems remain unresolved.

"Although LANL and LASO (DOE's Los Alamos Site Office) have increased their attention to fire protection and taken some actions to improve fire protection, resolution of issues has been piecemeal," wrote A. J. Eggenberger, the vice chairman of the safety board, in a May 31 letter accompanying the memo.

Greg Mello, director of the Los Alamos Study Group, a lab watchdog, said that if facilities at LANL don't fully meet national fire protection standards as the report suggests, they should be shut down.

"If this was Wal-Mart, would they be allowed to operate? If this were a nursing home would they be allowed to operate? This is a plutonium facility, and they are still allowed to operate," he said.

LASO spokesman Bernard Pleau said the site office intends to ensure LANL and its facilities meet all fire protection and safety requirements and is working on a new contract with the Los Alamos Fire Department to serve LANL.

Despite the recent experience of the 2000 Cerro Grande fire, the report suggests LANL has an out-of-date wildfire management plan and cut funds for a forest-thinning project.

"The result is the potential for unnecessary wildfire threats to nuclear facilities," according to the report.

LANL spokeswoman Kathy DeLucas said the wildfire management plan should be complete by this fall and that a slimmer budget necessitated cuts somewhere in the lab's spending. Since much of the forest thinning had already been accomplished, she said that cutting funds for hazardous fuel removal "is how we had to triage the budget."

Also, some lower-priority fire alarm systems will not be addressed in a current site-wide alarm replacement project, even though the report states that some have code deficiencies and are "of questionable long-term reliability." The report notes that LANL staff estimates that completing the fire alarm upgrades will cost about $42 million.

Many of the recommended improvements and fixes to fire-safety issues -- some of which warranted
federal nuclear safety violations -- are similar to those recorded by the board in its August 2003 review, according to the report.

LANL's DeLucas said that since the Cerro Grande fire, the lab has taken fire safety seriously and recognizes the shortcomings highlighted in the federal safety board's review.

"Part of the problem is that our facilities and equipment are old, so this is a long-term issue, but we have a plan in place with the dollars and people to back it up," she said.

LANL's second in command, Don Cobb, issued a March memo directing the lab to take a series of actions aimed at improving fire safety, including hiring three additional fire safety staffers, increasing the program's budget to $3 million (a 50 percent increase over the previous year) and preparing a follow-up report on actions to address maintenance issues.

But the report notes that more needs to be done.

It states that planning and scheduling are inadequate, self-assessment reviews are not being conducted according to DOE regulations and insufficient time is allotted for reviews and analyses.

The report suggests LANL needs about four more full-time positions to overcome these and other deficiencies -- one more than LANL intends to hire.

"Increasing staff appears to be a prerequisite for LANL's taking the next steps of systematically analyzing fire protection issues and developing a comprehensive plan for addressing these issues," the report states.
Disarmament activists bring message to LC

The Peace and Justice Center of Las Cruces will host a visit from the Los Alamos Study Group, an Albuquerque-based disarmament-oriented research and advocacy organization, on Saturday, June 11. LASG Executive Director Greg Mello will lead a presentation by members of the group, which is organizing a massive protest in Los Alamos on Aug. 6, the 60th anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

After a potluck lunch at noon, Mello, his wife Trish and Peter Nelles, along with other board members of LASG, will discuss their ongoing efforts to end nuclear weapons production in New Mexico and around the world and provide details of the Hiroshima 60 event.

Since co-founding the Study Group in 1989, Mello has guided the group’s research on the activities of the U.S. Nuclear weapons complex and its environmental consequences. He recently led a delegation of nine LASG members and spoke at the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty Review Conference in New York at the United Nations.

In 2002 Mello was a Visiting Research Fellow at Princeton’s Program on Science and Global Security. He is a member of the Governing Council of the worldwide Abolition 2000 nuclear disarmament organization. This year, the Albuquerque Tribune recognized him as one of its 10 “rising stars” for 2004. He has provided key information for government leaders and diplomats at treaty conferences in New York and Geneva, and his research, analysis and opinions have been published in The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Issues in Science and Technology, as well as the New Mexico press.

Over the past decade, Mello has led the Study Group in bringing to the attention of Congress and the news media a number of clandestine nuclear projects and programs, including a new earth-penetrating nuclear bomb; a nuclear glide bomb; the planned upgrade of more than 3,200 submarine warheads into ground-burst, first-strike weapons; above-ground testing of plutonium cores (“pits”) in steel tanks; and a laboratory program to “share” nuclear weapons secrets with “friendly” nuclear nations.

In early 2003, the Study Group played an important role in exposing a major nuclear weapons conference held later that year near Omaha at Offutt Air Force Base, headquarters of the U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM). In closed discussions, laboratory and production plant contractors, Pentagon staff and STRATCOM officers planned how to implement a policy of
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