



British American Security  
Information Council



## TacNukes News No. 2

September 2012

*This is the first of a new Email newsletter that will bring to your attention recent developments related to the reduction of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. We will send out this Newsletter as events warrant but no more than every couple of weeks.*

This Newsletter is being jointly published by the [Arms Control Association](#), the [British American Security Information Council](#) and the [Institute for Peace Research and Security at the University of Hamburg](#) under a joint project funded by the William and Flora Hewlett Foundation.

For more information on the project, please visit our website at <http://tacticalnuclearweapons.ifsh.de>

Sincerely,  
Paul Ingram (BASIC)  
Daryl Kimball (ACA)  
Oliver Meier (IFSH)

---

### In this Update

1. Is there a life after the DDPR? Statement from European Leaders.
2. Future arms control options evaluated in policy brief.
3. Debate on the B61 Life Extension Program picks up speed. Different contributions.
4. Foreign Ministers call to move forward with the "Action Plan" in ministerial statement.
5. UN Secretary General calls for withdrawal of nuclear weapons to possessor states.
6. New study on tactical nuclear weapons published by the Federation of American Scientists.

---

### 1. Is there a life after the DDPR? Statement from European Leaders.

The DDPR has done little to help create the conditions necessary for a world without nuclear weapons despite NATO committing itself to pursuit of this goal at the 2010 Summit in Lisbon.

We agree that there is an urgent need for increased transparency on Russian non-strategic nuclear weapons and for reciprocal Russian action in response to any moves made by NATO. But we also think that by limiting mainstream political interest largely to this Russian dimension of the nuclear problem, the states of central and Eastern Europe are making themselves vulnerable where it really matters, namely in their relationship with the United States.

Browne, Des; Kearns, Jan (August 2012) [NATO, Russia, and the Nuclear Disarmament Agenda: Reflections Post Chicago](http://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/nato-russia-and-the-nuclear-disarmament-agenda-reflections-post-chicago_418.html) (European Leadership Network for Multilateral Nuclear Disarmament and Non-proliferation)  
[http://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/nato-russia-and-the-nuclear-disarmament-agenda-reflections-post-chicago\\_418.html](http://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/nato-russia-and-the-nuclear-disarmament-agenda-reflections-post-chicago_418.html)



British American Security  
Information Council



## 2. Future arms control options in policy brief.

“Since neither side wants to reduce its nonstrategic forces because of disparity or to compensate for conventional inferiority, NATO is now limiting itself to pursuing softer issues such as transparency and confidence-building measures,” Kristensen said at a recent conference in Switzerland. “These are important and worthwhile steps but they will not in and of themselves result in reductions of nonstrategic nuclear weapons.”

Grossman, Elaine (September 2012) [Seeking Kremlin Engagement, NATO Weighs Next Nuclear Posture Steps](http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/seeking-kremlin-engagement-nato-weighs-next-nuclear-posture-steps/) (Global Security Newswire) <http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/seeking-kremlin-engagement-nato-weighs-next-nuclear-posture-steps/>

## 3. Debate on the B61 Life Extension Program picks up speed.

While the German government in Chicago has agreed to “ensure that all components of NATO’s nuclear deterrent remain safe, secure, and effective for as long as NATO remains a nuclear alliance,” it thus has yet to take hard decisions to keep Germany in the nuclear business and will have to explain this policy to a German public that is largely anti-nuclear.

Meier, Oliver (September 2012) [No German pledge on nuclear-capable aircraft modernization](http://armscontrolnow.org/2012/09/12/no-german-pledge-on-nuclear-capable-aircraft-modernization/) (Arms Control Now) <http://armscontrolnow.org/2012/09/12/no-german-pledge-on-nuclear-capable-aircraft-modernization/>

After having spent hundreds of millions of dollars between 2006 and 2010 on extending the service life of the secondary of the B61-7 (and adding new spin-rocket motors to improve performance), NNSA and DOD are now planning to scrap the weapon and replace it with the \$6 billion B61-12. Although the cost estimate of the B61 LEP has increased by 50 percent over the past year, the \$6 billion price tag is only part of the cost. The current B61-12 program should be stopped and reassessed to reduce cost and scope.

Kristensen, H. M. (June 2012) [B61 Nuclear Bomb Costs Escalating](http://www.fas.org/blog/ssp/2012/05/b61cost.php) (FAS Strategic Security Blog) <http://www.fas.org/blog/ssp/2012/05/b61cost.php>

If America really wants to show its commitment to its European allies, let's replace the B61s with solid-gold replicas, forward-deployed at the NATO air base of your choice.

Lewis, Jeffrey (September 2012) [A Steal at \\$10 Billion](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/09/05/a_steal_at_10_billion?print=yes&hidecomments=yes&page=full) (Foreign Policy) [http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/09/05/a\\_steal\\_at\\_10\\_billion?print=yes&hidecomments=yes&page=full](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/09/05/a_steal_at_10_billion?print=yes&hidecomments=yes&page=full)

News from Albuquerque on the the B61 case study in the expense and innovations driving the ambitious effort to maintain US nuclear defenses at a time of fiscal constraints and a shift away from reliance on nuclear deterrence.

Priest, Dana (September 2012) [The B61 bomb: A case study in needs and costs](http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/the-b61-bomb-a-case-study-in-needs-and-costs/2012/09/16/494aff00-f831-11e1-8253-3f495ae70650_story_2.html) (The Washington Post) [http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/the-b61-bomb-a-case-study-in-needs-and-costs/2012/09/16/494aff00-f831-11e1-8253-3f495ae70650\\_story\\_2.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/the-b61-bomb-a-case-study-in-needs-and-costs/2012/09/16/494aff00-f831-11e1-8253-3f495ae70650_story_2.html)

## 4. Foreign Ministers call to move forward with the "Action Plan" in ministerial statement.

Foreign Ministers of Australia, Canada, Chile, Germany, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Poland, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates, resolve to move forward with practical steps that will advance the implementation of the 2010 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference Action Plan (“Action Plan”) and to pursue the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons.



British American Security  
Information Council



Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative (September 2012) [Statement of the 5th Ministerial Meeting](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/cae/servlet/contentblob/627306/publicationFile/172363/120926-NPDI_DL.pdf)  
(German Federal Foreign Office) [http://www.auswaertiges-  
amt.de/cae/servlet/contentblob/627306/publicationFile/172363/120926-NPDI\\_DL.pdf](http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/cae/servlet/contentblob/627306/publicationFile/172363/120926-NPDI_DL.pdf)

#### **5. UN Secretary General calls for withdrawal of nuclear weapons to possessor states.**

Ban Ki-moon urges nuclear weapon states to “stop deploying nuclear weapons on foreign soil, and retire such weapons.”

Ban Ki-moon (August 2012) [World is over-armed and peace is under-funded](http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/opinion/2012/08/160_118435.html) (The Korea Times) [http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/opinion/2012/08/160\\_118435.html](http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/opinion/2012/08/160_118435.html)

#### **6. New study on tactical nuclear weapons published by the Federation of America Scientists.**

Mr. Kristensen argues that the time is ripe for new leadership in both the United States and Russia to take the next steps in phasing out U.S. non-strategic weapons deployed in Europe and in having Russia complete its commitments under the 1991-1992 Presidential Nuclear Initiatives, especially the requirement to eliminate its groundlaunched nuclear weapons. This report also wisely points out that “non-strategic nuclear weapons are neither the problem nor the solution” to NATO European countries’ security concerns. These weapons are anachronistic vestiges of Cold War thinking.

Kristensen, Hans M. (May 2012) [Non-Strategic Nuclear Weapons](http://www.fas.org/docs/Non_Strategic_Nuclear_Weapons.pdf) (Federation of American Scientists) [http://www.fas.org/docs/Non Strategic Nuclear Weapons.pdf](http://www.fas.org/docs/Non_Strategic_Nuclear_Weapons.pdf)

---

*Editors*

Katarzyna Kubiak, Researcher IFSSH

Oliver Meier, Researcher IFSSH and International Representative ACA

---

If you have information you would suggest should be included or to unsubscribe, contact [kubiak@ifsh.de](mailto:kubiak@ifsh.de)

---