

ON COMMON GROUND

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE RADICAL CLIMATE MOVEMENT
FROM THE RADICAL PEACE MOVEMENT

MILAN RAI, PEACE NEWS, MARCH 2015

‘There are two major dark shadows that hover over everything, and they’re getting more and more serious. The one is the continuing threat of nuclear war that has not ended. It’s very serious. And another is the crisis of ecological, environmental catastrophe, which is getting more and more serious. We’re racing towards a precipice, eyes open. We’re racing towards disaster.’

Noam Chomsky, 27 December 2013.¹

The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists has moved the hands of its famous ‘Doomsday Clock’ forward two minutes, to three minutes to midnight:

‘Unchecked climate change, global nuclear weapons modernizations, and outsized nuclear weapons arsenals pose extraordinary and undeniable threats to the continued existence of humanity, and world leaders have failed to act with the speed or on the scale required to protect citizens from potential catastrophe. These failures of political leadership endanger every person on Earth. The clock ticks now at just three minutes to midnight because international leaders are failing to perform their most important duty – ensuring and preserving the health and vitality of human civilization.’

The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 22 January 2015.²

This is an Open Letter trying to add to the dialogue between climate activists and disarmament activists about what we’re seeking. It’s particularly addressed to folk in these movements who see ourselves as ‘radical’.

WHAT MAKES US ‘RADICAL’?

It’s easy to think that being radical is about being confrontational, that it’s about using militant tactics. Noam Chomsky warned against this idea over 40 years ago: ‘to talk about the tactics as what is “radical” or “liberal” is to make a fundamental error.’³ Your aims can be radical or conservative, but not your tactics, Chomsky

argued: ‘They are successful or unsuccessful in achieving certain goals that may be discussed in terms of their political character.’⁴

Chomsky had some harsh words: ‘When people start concentrating on the character of the tactics, and regarding them as an index of political character, then they are taking an ultimately self-destructive approach. Without impugning anyone’s motives, I think that that is the kind of thing that a well-placed police spy would introduce into the movement if he [or she] were intent on destroying it.’⁵

In other words, being radical isn’t about being willing to be arrested or being confrontational. Being radical is about your analysis and your demands.

Let’s come back to this later.

COME TOGETHER

Yes, the climate movement and the peace movement are both working for survival (of humans and others). That doesn’t necessarily mean we have a common programme or much to learn from each other.

Yes, money devoted to nuclear weapons could be spent on climate action. The annual running cost of Britain’s Trident nuclear missile submarine system is officially around £2.4bn; the cost of replacing Trident with a like-for-like system has been estimated at around £100bn over several decades.⁶ But this kind of link could be made with almost any cause.

What else do the climate and nuclear disarmament movements have in common?

A JUST TRANSITION

Climate change is a reality today, it’s not just about two generations from now. We’re already seeing the impact of more frequent heatwaves, droughts, floods and storms. Quite apart from the climate effects, the fossil fuel industry is already imposing horrific costs on people and on other species. In her brilliant new book, *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs the Climate*, Naomi Klein describes some of the current impacts on natural environments, on indigenous peoples, on all sorts of people, all around the world. She also explains the many obstacles to getting off the track to runaway climate change, and some of the solutions that are well-known, but politically difficult to pursue.

Naomi Klein has praised a plan drawn up by trade unionists and environmental campaigners in Britain for massive government investment over 20 years to move Britain towards a low-carbon economy:

‘We need workers to build enough wind power, solar power, wave power and tidal power to meet all our energy needs. We need workers to insulate and retrofit all our existing homes and buildings in order to conserve energy. And we need workers to run a massive public transport system powered by renewable electricity. We have people who need jobs, and jobs that must be done. So we want the government to hire a million people to do new climate jobs now in an integrated National Climate Service.’ (*One Million Climate Jobs – Tackling the Environmental and Economic Crises*, 2014, third edition).⁷

Insulating and renovating buildings, building new buses and railways, manufacturing and assembling wind farms, building a new national energy grid, and so on: these are ‘climate jobs’ that reduce emissions, not ‘green jobs’ (for example, park rangers) that don’t affect the climate.

The idea is that the government should hire 90,000 new workers each month to do new climate jobs: ‘In a year we will have a million new jobs’. Anyone who loses their job in a high-carbon industry should be guaranteed a job in the National Climate Service at the same rate of pay they enjoyed in their previous work.

The cost of the programme to the government could be just £19bn a year, once you take into account new revenues from taxes and new services, according to the One Million Climate Jobs campaign. They believe this could be paid for by increasing income and wealth taxes on the richest 1%, by a small Tobin tax on financial transactions, and/or by government loans similar to the £75bn-a-year quantitative easing programme. This is all without diverting money from the military budget...

According to their calculations, the One Million Climate Jobs plan could cut Britain’s emissions by 80% over 20 years, ‘the lion’s share of what we need to do’. Cut energy demand in half, and turn almost all energy supply over to wind, waves, tides and sun – to cut Britain’s domestic emissions from 528 megatonnes of CO₂ to 106Mt.

In South Africa, there is also a One Million Climate Jobs campaign, drawn up by 40 civil society organisations, including

trade unions.⁸ The campaign writes: ‘we are aware that in the long term, climate change requires a massive change in how we live, how we produce and consume, and how we relate to nature and each other. We need systems change, and we need a bridge between where we are now and this vital but longer-term outcome. The One Million Climate Jobs Campaign offers such a bridge.’⁹

Both the South African and the British campaigns invoke the idea of a ‘Just Transition’ to a low-carbon economy. In 2008, the British trade union congress (TUC), the national federation of trade unions, defined a ‘Just Transition’ as one that wins public support for desperately-needed environmental policies by ensuring ‘a fair distribution of the costs and benefits of those policies across the economy’, and by involving those affected by the changes in making the economic plans.

Among the Just Transition provisions were a ‘national framework or mechanism to ensure long-term planning and representative decision making on environmental transition’.

The TUC emphasised that ‘Just Transition measures are needed to ensure that job loss as a result of environmental transition is minimised and that change within sectors does not occur at the expense of decent work and decent terms and conditions’. They also pointed out that a ‘Just Transition strategy is also required to ensure that environmental initiatives not necessarily related to employment – for example, green taxes – do not impact on lower income groups’.

There are moral responsibilities here, and also strategic issues. If this kind of provision is not made for workers in high-carbon industries, they and their families, and the communities they live in, are likely to resist and slow down the transition to a low-carbon economy.

NUCLEAR CONVERSION

There’s a connection here to something that’s important for the nuclear disarmament movement. There are moral issues and strategic questions around the effect on jobs if the government decides not to replace Trident with a similar submarine-launched ballistic missile system. This ‘Main Gate’ decision on ‘like-for-like’ replacement will be made in 2016.

The Nuclear Education Trust carried out a review in 2012 of alternatives for Barrow-in-Furness, where nearly 5,000 people are

employed building Britain's military submarines. Two of their four recommendations were:

‘1. The Government should make a clear and binding statement of its responsibility to Barrow (as well as any other towns exceptionally dependent on military contracts) in the event that military procurement decisions are changed.

‘2. In the event of a decision to proceed with an option other than a like for like replacement and which means a step down in employment, the Government must provide immediate, sustained and considerable support, which should include for instance regeneration funding at the level of £100 million for every 1,000 jobs lost to the local economy.’¹⁰

This is pointing in the direction of a peace movement equivalent to the TUC's Just Transition concept, a Just Transition away from military production towards socially-useful production.¹¹

The major thinker on the conversion of military industry to civilian production was Seymour Melman of Columbia University, New York. Melman once observed that the US had an arms control and disarmament agency in Washington that did not include ‘one single person directed to think about problems of how to formulate, negotiate, or implement a reversal of an arms race’. He added:

‘Indeed the idea of reversing the arms race as a way of improving security is virtually wiped out from public discussion. The press doesn't talk about it. The journals of opinion don't talk about it. The universities don't talk about it. And worst of all, in my view, the peace organizations don't talk about it. As long as peace organizations don't take up the reversal of the arms race and the parallel problems of what to do with the state capitalist controlled economy of the arms race, then the peace organizations are participating in a type of charade. A lot of talk about peace, but what is peace? In our time, peace is not simply the momentary absence of war. Because of the sustained operation of war planning, war preparation, peace has to mean diminishing the decision power of the war-making institutions. If that is set in motion then we are moving in a peaceful way.’¹²

Melman emphasised the need to empower working people in the process of conversion. The legislation that he supported laid down that, in every military factory, laboratory or base employing at least 100 people, an ‘Alternative Use Committee’ should be

set up of at least eight people, ‘with equal representation of the facility’s management and labor’. Melman wrote: ‘The firsthand knowledge of defense establishment employees is essential for conversion. Thus, conversion must be done locally; no remote central office can possess the necessary knowledge of people, facilities, and surroundings.’¹³

So there would be national legislation supporting economic conversion planning, and there would be decentralised action at military facilities themselves. There is a clear parallel here with the German experience with renewable energy, that Naomi Klein invokes in *This Changes Everything*:

‘The solution is most emphatically not energy nationalization on existing models. The big publicly owned oil companies... are just as voracious in pursuing high-end pools of carbon as their private sector counterparts.... A better model would be a new kind of utility – run democratically, by the communities that use them, as co-ops or as a “commons”, as author and activist David Bollier and others have outlined. This kind of structure would enable citizens to demand far more from their energy companies than they are able to now.... The transition [to renewable power in Germany] has occurred, first of all, within the context of a sweeping, national feed-in tariff program that includes a mix of incentives designed to ensure that anyone who wants to get into renewable power generation can do so.... This has encouraged small, noncorporate players to become renewable energy providers – farms, municipalities, and hundreds of newly formed co-ops. That has decentralized not just electrical power, but also political power and wealth.’¹⁴

The German renewable revolution created nearly 400,000 jobs as the share of renewable power in electricity generation went from 6% in 2000 to nearly 25% in 2013.¹⁵

Another aspect of Melman’s work that might be relevant to climate policy is that his favoured conversion legislation also created ‘a national commission directed to encourage capital investment planning by cities, counties, states and the federal government in all areas of infrastructure – the network of facilities and services that are the underpinnings of a modern industrial society’.¹⁶

Returning to the question of Barrow, a 2010 report by the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND), ‘Trident, jobs –

and the UK economy’, pointed out that Barrow has exactly the specialised skills needed to make turbines for marine and wind energy.¹⁷ In fact, this crossover was identified by a group of trade unionists who formed the Barrow Alternative Employment Committee (BAEC) – in 1987! The detailed technical BAEC report, ‘Oceans of Work’, identified new, civil engineering opportunities in the marine sector, ‘particularly offshore renewable energy systems like wind and wave power, with enhanced prospects for skilled manufacturing jobs over the medium to long term.’¹⁸

Like the Lucas Aerospace Plan¹⁹, a conversion plan also drawn up by workers, the BAEC report was ‘a new-style exercise in workplace democracy’²⁰ – threatening to established trade unions as well as to management.

Cancelling Trident replacement becomes politically more possible if workers in places like Barrow are offered the opportunity to use their skills in saving the planet rather than destroying it. If they are offered employment, training and wage guarantees in a National Climate Service, as proposed under the One Million Climate Jobs plan, even better. If they are included in the planning process for conversion of laboratories, bases and factories, something that *Peace News* favours in principle anyway, that makes it even easier to make the transition.

VITAL INTERESTS

All of the policies advocated above involve breaking with ‘free market’ thinking. In reality, the ‘free market’ is made up of gigantic corporate empires which internally resemble Soviet-style command economies, and externally suppress competition on a grand scale. If it was a country, ExxonMobil, the oil company, would have been the 27th largest economy in the world in 2013.²¹

In *This Changes Everything*, Naomi Klein repeatedly comes back to the barriers to dealing with climate change posed by neoliberalism. The ‘three policy pillars of the neoliberal age’ – privatisation, deregulation and cuts in both taxes and public spending – ‘form an ideological wall that has blocked a serious response to climate change for decades’.²²

The core problem behind both climate change and nuclear weapons runs deeper than neoliberalism. Let’s look at nuclear weapons, where things are less obvious than with climate change.

What are nuclear weapons for? In its 2010 strategic defence

and security review,²³ the British government said in its section on ‘Nuclear weapons policy’, ‘we remain deliberately ambiguous about precisely when, how and at what scale we would contemplate their use.’ (Section 3.5)

Two paragraphs later, the Conservative-Liberal Democrat government said, in a roundabout way,²⁴ that it might consider using or threatening to use nuclear weapons against a country that didn’t have nuclear weapons – if that country was developing chemical or biological weapons, and if it posed a ‘direct threat to the UK or its vital interests’. (Section 3.7)

Look at the end of that last sentence again. What are Britain’s ‘vital interests’?

Two years later, in December 2012, the coalition government repeated that it would use nuclear weapons to stop nuclear coercion ‘and acts of aggression against our vital interests that cannot be countered by other means’ (emphasis added). A couple of sentences later, the government said that, in order not to assist Britain’s enemies, ‘we do not define what we consider to be our vital interests’ (emphasis added).²⁵

Well, actually, Britain’s enemies have a pretty clear idea of what is meant by ‘vital interests’. The verbal fog is designed to hide the truth from us, Britain’s citizens.

It is clear from the 2010 strategic defence and security review that Britain’s ‘interests’ are separate from the territory of the UK, its remaining colonies, or its citizens around the world.²⁶

In fact, it is clear that Britain’s ‘vital interests’ are economic and financial in nature. The 2010 national security strategy²⁷ (NSS) said: ‘Prosperity is a core part of our national interest’. (Section 0.12) In their joint foreword to the NSS, David Cameron and Nick Clegg wrote: ‘In a world that is changing at an astonishing pace, Britain’s interests remain surprisingly constant. We are an open, outward-facing nation that depends on trade and has people living all over the world.’ (p. 4, emphasis added)

This definition of ‘vital interests’ – and their connection to nuclear weapons – have indeed remained surprisingly constant. If we go back to the Labour party’s strategic defence review²⁸ of 1998, we find the Blair administration deciding that the size of the British nuclear force ‘does not depend on the size of other nations’ arsenals but on the minimum necessary to deter any threat to our vital interests’. (Para. 61, emphasis added)

The SDR also said:

‘But our vital interests are not confined to Europe. Our economy is founded on international trade. Exports form a higher proportion of Gross Domestic Product than for the US, Japan, Germany or France. We invest more of our income abroad than any other major economy. Our closest economic partners are the European Union and the US but our investment in the developing world amounts to the combined total of France, Germany and Italy. Foreign investment into the UK also provides nearly 20% of manufacturing jobs. We depend on foreign countries for supplies of raw materials, above all oil.’ (Para. 19, emphases added)

So, Britain’s ‘vital interests’ include: British exports to other countries; British investments abroad – the SDR emphasises investments in the Global South; foreign investments into the UK; and raw materials imported into the UK, especially oil. This is the ‘prosperity’ that has to be protected by armed force, even nuclear force.

Britain’s nuclear weapons protect British business interests.

MILITARY CAPITALISM

The nuclear weapons complex also contributes to ‘prosperity’ through what has been called ‘military Keynesianism’. Chomsky quotes a *Business Week* article of 1949 that explained why military spending was better than spending on civilian goods and services in reviving the economy:

‘But there’s a tremendous social and economic difference between welfare pump-priming and military pump-priming. It [welfare spending] makes the government’s role in the economy – its importance to business – greater than ever. Military spending doesn’t really alter the structure of the economy. It goes through the regular channels. As far as a businessman [or woman] is concerned, a munitions order from the government is much like an order from a private customer. But the kind of welfare and public works spending that Truman plans does alter the economy. It makes new channels of its own. It creates new institutions. It redistributes income. It shifts demand from one industry to another. It changes the whole economic pattern.’²⁹

Business Week observed nearly 40 years later, that the Reagan Star Wars spending spree on anti-missile technologies would be extremely beneficial to the US technology sector: ‘Almost no cutting edge technology will go without a shot of new research

funds'. The article quoted the director of resource management at the programme's Pentagon office: '80% of our money is going to the private sector'.³⁰ This kind of spending has been extremely significant (if inefficient) in the past. The development of computers largely came about through US military research³¹; the internet originated with the Pentagon's ARPANET system.³²

US planners have been open in stating that nuclear weapons are not just about 'defending' the home territory; they also support an aggressive foreign policy. In June 1981, the then US arms control and disarmament agency director Eugene V Rostow publicly condemned one possible outcome of the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks (SALT) with the Soviet Union. Rostow said that a nuclear balance that enabled the USSR and the US merely to deter nuclear attacks on their homelands 'has always been rejected as a totally inadequate standard for nuclear negotiations'.

Rostow told the senate foreign relations committee: 'facing the Soviet strategic arsenal with such a SALT policy would imply we would be in no position to use conventional or nuclear forces in defense of our interests in Europe, the Far East, the Middle East, or elsewhere.'³³ Having a massive US nuclear arsenal made it easier to intervene around the world, because it 'deterred' the USSR and other powers from interfering with US aggression.

More recently, British (and US) planners have congratulated themselves on the success of nuclear threats in deterring Saddam Hussein from using chemical weapons during the invasion of Iraq in 1991. Brendan Jackson, air chief marshal of the British royal air force, boasted that Saddam had not used chemical weapons during the 1991 invasion because:

'Uppermost in his mind must have been the consideration that one weapon of mass destruction can be countered with another – and he could hardly have doubted that tactical nuclear weapons might be in the area.'³⁴

Nuclear weapons are not lying dormant as an insurance policy in case a crazed dictator some day manages to threaten Britain. Nuclear weapons are active elements of a foreign policy focused on securing 'prosperity', meaning corporate power and profits.³⁵

Chomsky wrote in 1985:

'Protest over Star Wars, massacre in El Salvador, and so on, is a sign of our weakness. A strong peace movement would be challenging military-based state capitalism and the world system it dominates'.

Chomsky conceded that ‘it would be wrong, even criminal, to fail to do what can be done to constrain the military system and to reduce the tensions and conflicts that may lead to its employment, terminating history’. But at the same time ‘it is suicidal to concentrate solely on plugging holes in the dike without trying to stem the flood at its source’:

‘For us, that means changing the structures of power and dominance that impel the state to crush moves towards independence and social justice within our vast domains and that constantly drive it towards militarization of the economy.’³⁶

It is very easy to extend these remarks to the way that unchallenged corporate power is driving us towards runaway climate change; the need for a ‘strong climate movement’ that can challenge ‘carbon-fuelled state capitalism and the world system it dominates’; and the folly of concentrating solely on plugging holes in the dike without trying to change the system more fundamentally. We are crossing other planetary boundaries as well as climate change.³⁷

EXPANDING THE FLOOR OF THE CAGE

Peace News has long argued in favour of what André Gorz called ‘non-reformist reform’. For example, radicals should not simply be demanding the repeal of the anti-trade union laws brought in by Margaret Thatcher. We should be trying to reach the political level of those Welsh miners who demanded just over 100 years ago the right of workers to elect their managers. They wrote in *The Miners’ Next Step* in 1912:

‘Today the shareholders own and rule the coalfields. They own and rule them mainly through paid officials. The men who work in the mine are surely as competent to elect these, as shareholders who may never have seen a colliery. To have a vote in determining who shall be your fireman, manager, inspector, etc., is to have a vote in determining the conditions which shall rule your working life. On that vote will depend in a large measure your safety of life and limb, your freedom from oppression by petty bosses, and would give you an intelligent interest in, and control over your conditions of work.’³⁸

Having workers elect managers does not abolish capitalism, but it goes a considerable way towards changing the balance of power in society between investors and the public. It goes a long way towards making a genuine democracy.

Similarly, a Basic Income, an unconditional and unwithdrawable minimum payment to all citizens, is not only morally right in itself, but it would alter the structure of power in society. Naomi Klein writes in *This Changes Everything* that a Basic Income (she calls it a ‘minimum income’) makes it more possible for workers to refuse dirty energy jobs, and ‘opens up a space for a full-throated debate about values’. She suggests that ‘forming a grand coalition to demand a guaranteed minimum income’ might do more good in stopping climate change than fighting for a minimal carbon tax.³⁹

In whatever proposals we make for change, for survival, we should not just be reducing the risks of disaster; we should also be increasing democratic control of the process of change, and of the new institutions being created. This spirit runs through *This Changes Everything*.

It is the undemocratic control of major investment decisions (for example in transport, energy, housing, agriculture) that lies at the core of our climate crisis. It is the power of concentrations of private wealth that leads to aggressive foreign policies that require nuclear terror to support them, and to military Keynesianism as a method of subsidising the private economy.⁴⁰

There is an argument that the climate crisis is so severe that we must limit investors’ rights in order to save ourselves from corporate greed.

There is a more radical argument, which is at the heart of *This Changes Everything*, but I don’t think is fully spelled out, that the ‘right’ of investors to control giant pools of capital – to own productive resources, and to employ others to use them (only) in a way that maximises profit and market share – is illegitimate as well as dangerous.

A radical argument is that in relation to socially-significant productive resources (land, factories, and so on), there should be no rights of personal private ownership, and that control over such resources should be exercised democratically by the people who work with, or who are affected by the use of, these resources.

If you accept that kind of anti-capitalist perspective, it is easy to slip into believing that the climate crisis (or the nuclear arms race) can only really be resolved by abolishing the state and capitalism, and that no reform short of such a massive social revolution is worth pursuing. Quite apart from the question of time – the

climate clock is running out much faster than the revolution clock – Chomsky is well-known for advocating a different approach to strategy, which he heard well-expressed in rural workers’ unions in Brazil:

‘One of the slogans that they use which is relevant here, is that we should “expand the floor of the cage.” “We know we’re in a cage. We know we’re trapped. We’re going to expand the floor, meaning we will extend to the limits what the cage will allow. And we intend to destroy the cage. But not by attacking the cage when we’re vulnerable, so they’ll murder us.” That’s completely correct. You have to protect the cage when it’s under attack from even worse predators from outside, like private power. And you have to expand the floor of the cage, recognizing that it’s a cage. These are all preliminaries to dismantling it. Unless people are willing to tolerate that level of complexity, they’re going to be of no use to people who are suffering and who need help, or, for that matter, to themselves.’⁴¹

Chomsky said on another occasion: ‘it’s true that the anarchist vision in just about all its varieties has looked forward to dismantling state power and personally I share that vision. But right now it runs directly counter to my goals: my immediate goals have been, and now very much are, to defend and even strengthen certain elements of state authority that are now under severe attack.’⁴²

Chomsky again: ‘in my opinion the immediate goal of even committed anarchists should be to defend some state institutions, while helping to pry them open to more meaningful public participation, and ultimately to dismantle them in a much more free society.’⁴³ That’s part of what non-reformist reform is about – what in a peace-making context Seymour Melman called ‘diminishing the decision power of the war-making institutions’. That’s the kind of radical approach to climate action and nuclear disarmament that *Peace News* advocates.

Let’s demand changes that increase our chances of survival, and that also support and empower the people affected by the process of change – including the people who work in dirty energy and the nuclear weapons economy. Otherwise, we’re not going to head away from the precipice or move the hands of the Doomsday clock.

NOTES

- 1 'Noam Chomsky: The Final Smiley & West', Public Radio International, 27 December 2013; quotation begins 26 minutes 43 seconds into the interview.
- 2 '2015 It is 3 minutes to midnight', *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, 22 January 2015: <http://thebulletin.org/clock/2015>
- 3 Noam Chomsky, 'In Defense of the Student Movement', available on <http://www.chomsky.info>
- 4 Noam Chomsky, 'The Politicization of the University', 1971, in *Radical Priorities*, Black Rose Books, 1981, p. 205.
- 5 Noam Chomsky, 'The Politicization of the University', 1971, in *Radical Priorities*, Black Rose Books, 1981, p. 205. Chomsky also warned that 'the search for confrontations indicates intellectual bankruptcy': 'It indicates the lack of effective politics which would, if carried out, lead, very likely, to confrontations.' He warned that the search for confrontations can become a manipulative and coercive tactic 'which attempts to bring people to a certain degree of commitment, not by having it grow out of their own understanding and experience in the realities of the world, but as the result of a situation which often does not reflect the realities of society.' Chomsky described this possibility as 'dangerous'. *Op. cit.*, p. 204.
- 6 Greenpeace, '£97 billion for Trident: five times government estimates', 18 September 2009; Scottish CND, '£100 billion cost of Trident replacement', 18 December 2013. Both available online.
- 7 Jonathan Neale (Campaign against Climate Change) ed., *One Million Climate Jobs*, Campaign Against Climate Change, 2014. Available at: <http://www.climate-change-jobs.org/>
- 8 <http://www.climatejobs.org.za/>
- 9 *One Million Climate Jobs: A just transition to a low carbon economy to combat unemployment and climate change*, 2011, p. 7.
- 10 Nuclear Education Trust, 'Trident Alternatives Review and the future of Barrow', 2012, p. 20.
- 11 This point is made in CND, 'Trident, jobs and the UK economy', 2010.
- 12 Seymour Melman, 'Practical Steps Toward Disarmament And Economic Conversion'. Available online.
- 13 Seymour Melman, 'Disarmament, Economic Conversion and Jobs for All', *Uncommon Sense*, 8 October 1995. Available online.
- 14 Naomi Klein, *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs the Climate*, Allen Lane, 2014, pp. 130 f.
- 15 Naomi Klein, *This Changes Everything*, p. 97. The jobs figure is from p. 131.

- 16 Seymour Melman, 'The Economics of Conversion – An Interview with Seymour Melman', *Multinational Monitor*, February 1988. Available online.
- 17 CND, 'Trident, jobs and the UK economy', 2010. Available online at <http://cnduk.org> – <http://bit.ly/1AJXy4l>
- 18 Steven Schofield, 'Oceans of Work: Arms Conversion Revisited', BASIC, 2007, p. v. Available online at http://www.basicint.org/sites/default/files/oceans_0.pdf
- 19 Hilary Wainwright and Andy Bowman, 'A real green deal', *Red Pepper*, October 2009. Available online at <http://www.redpepper.org.uk/a-real-green-deal/>
- 20 Maggie Mort, *Building the Trident Network: A Study of the Enrollment of People, Knowledge, and Machines*, MIT Press, 2002, p. 156. Available to view on Google Books.
- 21 In his book about ExxonMobil, *Private Empire*, US reporter Steve Coll quoted a 1999 cable from the US embassy in Chad noting that Exxon was ignoring US diplomats there. Coll then asks: 'And why should it be otherwise? Exxon Mobil's investments in the Chad-Cameroon oil project would amount to \$4.2 billion. Annual aid to Chad from the United States was only about \$3 million.' Cited in Adam Hochschild, 'Well-Oiled Machine "Private Empire," Steve Coll's Book About Exxon Mobil', *New York Times*, 8 June 2012. Available online.
- 22 Naomi Klein, *This Changes Everything*, pp. 72 f.
- 23 'Securing Britain in an age of uncertainty: the strategic defence and security review', 2010. The SDSR is available online at <https://www.sis.gov.uk>
- 24 First the government promised that it would not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapon states that were signed up to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). It then gave itself a couple of loopholes, including this: 'We also note that while there is currently no direct threat to the UK or its vital interests from states developing capabilities in other weapons of mass destruction, for example chemical and biological, we reserve the right to review this assurance if the future threat, development and proliferation of these weapons make it necessary.' In other words, the government might consider using or threatening the use of nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear signatory to the NPT if it (a) was 'developing [chemical or biological weapons] capabilities' and (b) posed a direct threat to 'the UK or its vital interests'. 'Securing Britain in an age of uncertainty', 2010, section 3.7.
- 25 'We do not want to simplify the calculations of a potential aggressor....' Ministry of defence, 'Maintaining an effective, independent nuclear deterrent', December 2012. Available online at <http://bit.ly/1Eiadu4>

- 26 There are over 30 references to ‘interests’ in the strategic defence and security review (SDSR) that clearly mean things outside the UK. For example, there are several reference to threats to ‘the UK *and* its interests overseas’ (Sections 1.4; 4.A.1; 4.A.3, emphasis added) The document says that the role of the national security council is to provide ‘security for the UK, its *interests* and people’ (Section 6.11, emphasis added). So ‘interests’ are separate from the territory of the UK, and from its citizens, wherever they might be. When the SDSR defines the seven military tasks, one is ‘defending the UK and its Overseas Territories’, and another, quite separate, is ‘defending our *interests* by projecting power’. (Section 2.14, emphasis added) The SDSR says Britain may intervene overseas ‘in support of the UK’s vital interests, *and* to protect our overseas territories and people’. (p. 12, emphasis added) So ‘vital interests’ are different from the home territory, overseas possessions and from the British population living abroad.
- 27 ‘A Strong Britain in an Age of Uncertainty: The National Security Strategy’, HMSO, 2010. Available online.
- 28 ‘Strategic Defence Review’, HMSO, 1998. Available online at <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/>. Link: <http://bit.ly/1yWyVvx>
- 29 ‘From Cold War to Cold Peace?’, *Business Week*, 12 February 1949, cited in Noam Chomsky, *Turning the Tide: US Intervention in Central America and the Struggle for Peace*, South End Press, 1985, pp. 209 f.
- 30 *Business Week*, 8 April 1985, cited in Chomsky, *Turning the Tide*, p. 211.
- 31 United States Army Research Library, ‘ARL Computing History’, <http://www.arl.army.mil/www/default.cfm?page=148>
- 32 DARPA, ‘History’, <http://www.darpa.mil/about/history/history.aspx>
- 33 ‘Nomination of Eugene V. Rostow: hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, Ninety-seventh Congress, first session, on nomination of Eugene V. Rostow, to be director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency (ACDA), June 22 and 23, 1981’, GPO, 1981, p. 11, cited in Christopher Paine, ‘On the Beach: The Rapid Deployment Force And The Nuclear Arms Race’, in AFSC, *The Deadly Connection: Nuclear War & U.S. Intervention*, AFSC, 1983, pp.70 f.
- 34 Brendon Jackson, ‘Air Power’, *RUSI Journal*, August 1992, p. 27. Nuclear threats were also made in the run-up to the 2003 invasion, but Iraq did not have any usable chemical weapons to be deterred. For more on 1991, see Milan Rai and Declan McHugh, *Nuclear Targeting of the Third World*, CND, 1992. To take one source of nuclear threats in 2003, the then British defence secretary Geoff Hoon stated three times that British nuclear weapons could be used against Iraq, for example if British troops were threatened by chemical or biological weapons – Hugo Young, ‘Hoon’s talk of pre-emptive strikes could be catastrophic’, *Guardian*, 6 June 2002. Available online; search for article title.