At 8:15 AM on August 6, 1945, humankind committed its most tragic and awful act of self-destruction with the first nuclear bomb exploding above the city of Hiroshima, Japan. Three days later a second such device was detonated over Nagasaki. Within four months of the bombings over 220,000 human beings – mostly civilians, mostly innocent of the war being waged – had died. Half of the deaths occurred during the initial explosions. The number of deaths due to delayed radiation injury from the fallout remains inadequately quantified even to this day. Unfortunately the horror of the moment produced exactly the opposite response that would have been appropriate. At the end of the second World War, we descended into an arms race rushing headlong into the capability of annihilating ourselves several times over.

By 1979 the threat of such nuclear annihilation still loomed large; in fact, it had grown. The world seemed increasingly unstable; the Iranian revolution and the taking of American hostages, the Three Mile Island meltdown, the aftermath of the wars in South East Asia, and Watergate all increased our collective angst. A small group of physicians gathered in Judy Lipton’s living room and formed the Washington chapter of Physicians for Social Responsibility. Those were the days of Paul Beeson and Helen Caldicott’s “bombing runs” (simulations of nuclear bombs being detonated). Lacking office space, we met in Anne Hall’s church for a time. Out of humble beginnings we have done great things, remaining active and successful on the issue of nuclear disarmament ever since. We were part of two Nobel Peace Prize winning coalitions (IPPNW and ICAN). The number of nuclear weapons worldwide has been reduced, and treaties for limitations and reductions signed. However, there remains much to be done.

In 1896, Swedish scientist Svante Arrhenius described the heat trapping effects of atmospheric carbon dioxide. By 1988 it was clear that anthropogenic global warming was actually happening. NASA scientist James Hansen implored Congress to take action in June of that year. Ignoring these facts for decades, we continue to treat our atmosphere as an industrial sewer.
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What 40 Years Means to WPSR
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With “thousand year” weather events occurring annually, the northward spread of tropical infections, and the annual tragic wildfire seasons producing predictable “bad air days,” we are compelled to act. The WPSR Climate & Health Task Force formed five years ago and initially cut its teeth successfully opposing new fossil fuel infrastructure in our state. We have expanded our work into advocacy for carbon pricing, 100% renewable energy commitments, and assistance to the most environmentally vulnerable communities in our state.

Economic inequity is the common thread tying our other two programs together. Every dollar spent on weapons is one not spent on alleviating poverty, reducing harm, and improving access to health care. The health impacts of burning fossil fuels are hitting low-income communities right now and will continue to hit them the hardest.

Will WPSR be needed for another 40 years? We absolutely will. We have made progress, but our gains remain fragile. While the number of nuclear weapons worldwide has decreased under our watch, the number of nations possessing them has not. With India and Pakistan both having nuclear capabilities, with the rollback of the INF treaty and President Trump thumbing his nose at the Iranian deal, and the principle of “no first use” finally gaining traction, we cannot afford to let up now. On the issue of climate change, we have awoken the medical community at large and are positioned to make significant gains in our state. Yet, translating that into federal and international policy remains a great challenge. Economic inequity and racism improved in the last half of the twentieth century, but not to anywhere near an adequate degree – having taken a drastic turn for the worst in the first two decades of the 21st century.

We are in this for the long haul. We need a healthy combination of impatience with the status quo and perseverance. I hope you all can imagine a world in which our organization is no longer necessary—a world with no nuclear weapons, a world with no burning fossil fuels, a world in which everyone earns a living wage and one’s personal health is not determined by the wealth of their parents. Until that day, we will continue to fight the good fight, powered by compassion and undaunted by the odds.

Preventing New Fossil Fuel Projects in King County
By Dianne Glover, MD, and Sarah Cornett, Climate Program Organizer

In a major victory, the King County Council passed an ordinance preventing new fossil fuel facilities in a 6-3 vote in January. Introduced by Councilmember Dave Upthegrove, the moratorium resembles similar policies in Whatcom County, Tacoma, and Portland, that protect health and safety from new coal, oil, and gas projects and take action on our climate crisis.

The ordinance prevents new major fossil fuel infrastructure, such as coal and oil export terminals, from being built in unincorporated King County. Current Washington state law limits this type of moratorium to six-month increments, but the Council can renew after a public hearing when the term expires.

This moratorium is a win for health. WPSR published a research report making the case for it and sent letters and made calls to Council members. Four of our Climate & Health Task Force physicians (Dr. Dianne Glover, Dr. Ken Lans, Dr. Annemarie Dooley, and Dr. Margaret Kitchell) testified before the County Council about the health impacts of climate change and fossil fuel infrastructure. You can watch our testimonies on the WPSR website here.

We worked closely with 350 Seattle and other groups, including the Sierra Club and the Power Past Fracked Gas coalition, in support of this historic ordinance.

For nearly five years, WPSR has been a major part of the regional “Thin Green Line” movement that’s successfully stopped major oil and coal export terminals in Washington and Oregon. These new land use campaigns are the next phase in this work for climate and energy justice by preventing harmful projects from being proposed in our backyard.
WPSR Members Support Historic Climate Bill Package in Legislative Session
By Sarah Cornett and Margaret Kitchell, MD

WPSR’s Climate & Health Task Force has endorsed five bills in this year’s Washington State Legislative Session that represent bold steps toward reducing climate change and improving health. As these important policies have made their way through the legislative process in Olympia, WPSR members have been active supporters—from lobbying legislators in Olympia, testifying in front of committees, convening support from the medical community, and publishing articles on the health benefits of clean energy.

100% Clean Energy
This landmark bill would require that electric utilities in Washington remove fossil fuel sources from their grids by 2045, with interim targets between now and then. It also includes important low-income energy assistance provisions and targets investments in new solar, wind, and other renewable energy projects with support for workers. WPSR helped convene a health organization endorsement letter signed by the Washington State Medical Association, the Washington Academy of Family Physicians, Providence St. Joseph Health, the American Lung Association, and others.

Healthy Environment for All (HEAL) Act
We know that certain Washington communities experience far more pollution than others. This bill creates a shared definition of environmental justice for state agencies, ensuring that health disparities are reflected in investments, policies, and other programs. Dr. Ken Lans testified in support of this bill, and WPSR members have sent letters of support to legislators. The Senate has moved this bill forward; it now awaits a vote in the House.

Low Carbon Fuel Standard
This bill, already on the books in California and Oregon, would require petroleum manufacturers to reduce the carbon intensity of their fuels. Because transportation is Washington’s top source of carbon pollution, this policy would make a big dent in emissions. A study of California’s clean fuels program recently found that it saved over $8 billion in healthcare costs due to the air benefits!

Oil Spill Prevention
While we were successful in passing a similar bill last year, more work is needed to ensure Washington is adequately protected from risks of oil spills—especially for oil carried by vessel through Washington’s coastal waters. As oil transport through our region expands, this policy strengthens existing protections by closing regulatory loopholes and banning offshore drilling.

Clean Buildings
Buildings are responsible for 27% of Washington’s greenhouse gas emissions. This bill promotes energy efficiency standards in buildings and invests in clean energy job growth, which will lead to significant reductions in carbon pollution and promote healthier environments in schools, businesses, hospitals, and homes.

Below: Dr. Ken Lans is joined by supporters of the HEAL Act from the Front & Centered coalition.
Call to State Legislature to Prevent Nuclear War Ends up in X-File

By Carly Brook and Alexander Tufel, member of UW student Beyond the Bomb chapter

Washington Against Nuclear Weapons (WANW) organized grassroots support for Senate Joint Memorial 8006 during the 2019 Washington state legislative session. This memorial requested that the U.S. Congress impose checks and balances on a President’s ability to start a nuclear war. The bill put the impacts of nuclear weapons on Washington residents on display at the highest level of governance in Washington state.

WANW, a statewide coalition of activists united for a future free of nuclear weapons, hopes to halt the $1.7 trillion overhaul of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, with the long term goal of eliminating all nuclear weapons.

Aside from curtailing a U.S. President’s ability to launch a preemptive strike, the memorial also asks that the President not have unilateral authority to use nuclear weapons, supports removing U.S. nuclear weapons from hair-trigger alert, cancelling the planned $1.7 trillion rebuilding of our nuclear arsenal, and pursuing multilateral, verifiable disarmament with other nuclear powers—leading to the total elimination of all nuclear weapons.

SJM 8006 was drafted with grassroots involvement, was backed by over 40 organizations statewide, and was co-sponsored by Senators Bob Hasegawa, Patty Kuderer, Sam Hunt, David Frockt, Jamie Pederson, and Rebecca Saldaña.

On Feb. 22, 2019, SJM 8006 had a public hearing at the Senate State Government, Tribal Relations & Elections Committee.

Hasegawa opened the hearing by recounting the nuclear weapons experimentation that occurred in the Marshall Islands during the Cold War and his opposition to the current nuclear arms race of the Trump administration.

“I think this whole escalation of the nuclear arms race that is kicking into gear again is just as sociopathic and unconscionable as what we did to those people,” Hasegawa said. “The fear that this brings on of just global annihilation at the disposal of one person ... I think needs to be corrected.”

Hasegawa added that given that Washington state has the highest concentration of nuclear weapons in the country, it would be a “prime target” during a nuclear exchange.

According to Crosscut, 20 miles from Seattle is Naval Base Kitsap, home port to eight out of the 14 Trident ballistic missile submarines. The base also houses an underground nuclear weapons storage complex. Altogether, the base contains over 1,300 nuclear warheads. This is not only the single largest concentration in the country, but the world.

Nine other activists from various grassroots organizations also gave testimonies, voicing their concerns with U.S. nuclear policy and its current dangerous trajectory.

“For half a century, nuclear weapons have continuously threatened to destroy all life on earth,” Glen Anderson from the Olympia Coalition to Abolish Nuclear Weapons said.

“If something were to go haywire right now in our nuclear system, 30 minutes from now all of us could be dead.”

He urged those listening to consider the fact that, while only Congress can officially declare war, no such impediment is placed on the President’s ability to wage nuclear war. “Let us hope we never have a President who is emotionally unstable,” Anderson said. “Let us hope we never have a President who is reckless and impulsive.”

WPSR Executive Director Laura Skelton mentioned the Trump administration’s recent withdrawal from the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, which she said could trigger a new arms race, according to experts. Those living close to deployed nuclear weapons would be most at risk.

“SJM 8006 is an important tool for sending a message to our President and our federal leaders,” Skelton said. “Please pass this measure.”

Given that the Senate Rules Committee failed to consider SJM 8006 before the March 13 cutoff date, WANW will have to take a second swing at passing this legislation next year. The Joint Memorial ended up in what is called the “X-File” where the Rules Committee may place bills that will go no further in the legislative process this year. WANW hopes that legislators next year make the right choice for the safety and health of their constituents—and the world. Our country’s dangerous and reckless nuclear policy must be changed.
Can Adam Smith Save Us from a New Arms Race?
By Carly Brook, Nuclear Weapons Abolition Organizer

As WPSR’s health professionals have long argued, only prevention is relevant when it comes to nuclear war. It’s for this reason that we are fully engaged in current policy discussions aimed at ensuring the U.S. would never use nuclear weapons first.

This is why we are paying close attention to the No First Use Act, introduced in Congress this year by Rep. Adam Smith (WA) and Sen. Elizabeth Warren (MA). As Chair of the House Armed Services Committee, Rep. Adam Smith has repeatedly stepped up with conversations about current policies and the size of our arsenals. When introducing the No First Use Act, Smith said, “The United States should not use nuclear arms in a first strike. They are instruments of deterrence, and they should be treated as such. A declaratory policy of not using nuclear weapons first will increase strategic stability, particularly in a crisis, reducing the risk of miscalculation that could lead to an unintended all-out nuclear war.”

On March 6, the House Armed Services Committee (HASC) held a historic hearing: “Outside Perspectives on Nuclear Deterrence Policy and Posture.” This hearing allowed Committee members to interrogate experts on policies not altered since the end of the Cold War. Three expert witnesses testified: Ms. Joan Rohlfing, President and COO of The Nuclear Threat Initiative; Dr. Bruce Blair, a research scholar in the program on Science and Global Security at Princeton University; and the Honorable Franklin C. Miller, principal at the Scowcroft Group.

These witnesses engaged in a dynamic conversation about the high price tag for the modernization of nuclear weapons paired with the argument for updating and upgrading nuclear weapons systems. While Rep. Smith raised no objections to the idea of nuclear deterrence or the need to modernize U.S. arsenals, he did sharply criticize the cost of modernization and the current size of our arsenals. Rep. Smith said, “What I question is whether or not we need to do it to the tune of more than $1.2 trillion, as both the 2010 the 2018 Nuclear Posture Reviews called into question.”

Representative Smith facilitated the March 6 HASC hearing.

Another topic of concern for the Representatives on the HASC was the risk of abandoning treaties like the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF) and the New START Treaty with Russia. Given rising global tensions, Rep. Smith stepped out to challenge the nuclear status quo by asking: “We are now about to kick off another nuclear arms race.

Is that a smart thing to do without at least talking to our adversaries?”

In these perilous times, we need members of Congress like Rep. Smith who are willing to ask the hard questions. We extend our gratitude and deep appreciation for this type of bold leadership to make the world safer from the possibility of nuclear war.

However, we must still ask the question: will Congress save us from the possibility of nuclear apocalypse? Policy advocacy must be backed up by grassroots movement building to create the necessary pressure on legislators to step up to the plate and make a difference. That is why our participation in and support of the Washington Against Nuclear Weapons coalition is essential.

Advocating for policies like No First Use allows us to shed much needed light on dusty, decades-old U.S. nuclear weapons policies. So far, the No First Use Act (H.R.921, S.272) has garnered 22 co-sponsors in the House of Representatives and 13 co-sponsors in the Senate. We thank Washington Representatives Larsen, Jayapal, and Heck for their co-sponsorship of this critical legislation. We are currently calling on other Washington members of Congress to stand on the right side of history and support No First Use. Please help us advocate by contacting your members of Congress to build additional support for what would be an important shift in U.S. nuclear weapons policy.
Having lived through the terrifying Cold War when threats of mutual annihilation were the norm, I recall the immense relief we all felt when diplomacy finally prevailed.

In December 1987, U.S. President Ronald Reagan and Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev signed the landmark Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. President Donald Trump has announced that the United States intends to withdraw from the agreement. This represents one of President Trump’s most dangerous moves yet.

It’s important to briefly review the history of the agreement. Beginning in 1979 the Soviet Union deployed SS-20 missiles in Eastern Europe, and NATO prepared to deploy intermediate-range missiles in Europe. This accelerating nuclear arms race put European cities in the crosshairs, introducing the unacceptable risk of nuclear weapons unleashed on cities minutes away.

The response from citizens was unprecedented. Massive protest marches occurred all across Western Europe, the biggest in post-war European history. In the U.S., the nuclear-freeze movement spread rapidly, with hundreds of towns and cities calling for a halt to this deployment. In June 1982, close to a million people converged on New York’s Central Park for “The Rally to Reverse the Arms Race,” perhaps the largest peace rally in U.S. history.

Back and forth negotiations were stalled by nuclear hawks in the U.S., and the aging Kremlin bosses clung to their missiles. People in the streets refused to go away, with public calls for a “zero option,” no short-range missiles. In 1985 Mikhail Gorbachev came to power and declared his support for nuclear disarmament internationally. During their 1986 summit at Reykjavik, Iceland, both agreed to the zero option, details were worked out, and the INF Treaty was signed in 1987.

The INF Treaty contributed to the end of the Cold War and played a significant role in reducing the global nuclear arms race. It also opened the door for other historic nuclear disarmament treaties that led to major reductions in the number of nuclear weapons by both countries.

There is evidence that Russia is violating the treaty, but Trump’s precipitous decision to withdraw from it contradicts ongoing efforts to hold Russia accountable while attempting to preserve the treaty. Sophisticated diplomacy, for an issue of such importance, calls for a concerted effort to fix, not abandon, it. The chorus of objections to his plans has been massive – from European leaders, foreign policy experts, national leaders, and certainly nuclear activists.

A new nuclear arms race, threatened by this president, is the height of irresponsibility, given the monstrous humanitarian risks from these weapons.

It was outrage on the part of citizenry across the world that demanded and got this treaty into effect; we need the same today. And it must surely be true, as Pope Francis remarked in April 2016, that the abolition of war (and nuclear weapons) remains “the ultimate and most deeply worthy goal of human beings.” There have been prominent politicians around the world who understand this. We need many of them, including Washington members of Congress, to speak up now.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan signed the INF treaty in 1987.
New Faces at WPSR
We are thankful to welcome two amazing new team members! We wanted to introduce you.

**Minoo Damanpour**
Board Member

1. What inspired you to join WPSR's Board of Directors?
Learning about WPSR's initiatives, which are in line with my beliefs of peace, equality, and justice, inspired me to join and serve this organization. I'm also delighted that WPSR has given me a "purpose" in my life.

2. What aspect of WPSR's mission/work do you find most compelling and why?
Every aspect of WPSR's work fascinates me since they are relevant now and in the future. It's uplifting to see dedicated, caring physicians advocate for betterment of people's health and our environment. Each initiative — climate change, economic inequality, nuclear weapons — is extremely important and requires close attention and much effort.

3. You have traveled a lot. What has that taught you?
My travels have taught me of other people and cultures, and the fact that people's basic needs are all the same. It has further shown that our actions in this country affect others globally.

4. How do you think your experience can enhance WPSR's work?
My background in leadership, emphasis on diversity, and managing a diverse workforce allows me to be effective and contribute positively to WPSR's work/mission. I have already begun to be an informal PR person for WPSR!

5. Do you have a hobby or activity you like to spend time on outside of your work with WPSR?
My passions are nature and art. Besides my interest in international traveling, I enjoy hiking and being out in nature in our area. Moreover, I like opera, music, visiting museums, and of course reading.

**Carly Brook**
Organizer,
Nuclear Weapons Abolition Program

1. What compels you to work on nuclear weapons abolition?
I went to my first anti-war protest when I was eight years old, after the beginning of the Anti-War protests during the many wars in the Middle East. As I grew up, studied abroad in Chile, Cuba, and Ecuador, and traveled with my family to Palestine and South Africa, I began to understand the function of U.S. policies and influence around the world. As a person who was born in 1993, in my lifetime, my country has always been at war with at least seven other countries.

I am compelled to work on nuclear weapons because these particular kinds of weapons pose the single greatest risk to human survival and the future of the planet as we know it. I believe that we could make great strides forward in the movement for peace and justice through passing policies that reduce or eliminate nuclear arsenals in the U.S. and globally.

2. What is your philosophy of organizing?
As an organizer I have been trained in an anti-racist analysis and principles with the People's Institute for Survival and Beyond and been in collaboration with movement against wars of aggression with the International League of People's Struggles. Many teachers who I have been lucky enough to learn from have helped ground me in organizing strategies that center most impacted communities and help me trust in community power for collective liberation.

3. How do you think we can engage younger people in conversations about nuclear weapons policy?
Youth have been at the forefront of every major movement for social change. I think youth can become leaders in the movement to abolish nuclear weapons if we share our resources and spaces openly with young people.
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Through solid organizing in a style that reaches and engages younger people, we can build up young people into leadership in our movement and community. Particularly by centering stories, multi-media education, and advocacy of people most impacted, I believe the movement for nuclear weapons disarmament can successfully be transferred to the next generation.

4. What have you enjoyed about your first couple of months at WPSR?
I have enjoyed learning the history of the brilliance, strategy, and spirit of the anti-nuke movement from our task force members and coalition partners. As a young person, I am deeply inspired by the work of the past generations in leading the call for justice and peace. I have particularly enjoyed learning the local history of the fight to prevent nuclear war in the Seattle region, where I grew up and where my family is from. I am particularly excited about the possibility of advancing this movement through linking and raising the fight against nuclear weapons with other current social justice issues like military spending, anti-racism, education, and climate change.

5. Do you have a hobby or activity you like to spend time on when you’re not working to save the world?
I love to play and learn folk songs. I’m always singing! I play piano, guitar, flute, saxophone, and trumpet.

Top: Minoo Damanpour and Laura Skelton at the MLK Day march in Seattle.

Middle: Carly Brook facilitates the annual strategic planning retreat for WPSR’s Nuclear Weapons Abolition Task Force.

Left: Members of Washington Against Nuclear Weapons celebrate the successful passage of Senate Joint Memorial 8006 by the Senate State Government, Tribal Relations & Elections Committee.
Reflections on Our Annual Dinner: Thanks for Your Support!
Laura Skelton, Executive Director

On Saturday, March 2, 2019, WPSR held our annual dinner and fundraiser. This year was extra special because WPSR is celebrating its 40th year. I want to thank everyone who joined us and to especially thank all of you who provided financial support to fuel our critical education and advocacy work!

We debuted a video that highlights some of the wonderful people and special moments of the past four decades. In case you missed it—or you just want to see it all over again—it’s available here on Youtube. It was such a treat for me to hear stories from so many amazing advocates—and to continue to learn more about moments in our organization’s fascinating history, from bringing 20,000 people to the King Dome to learn about nuclear weapons to talking to middle schoolers about gun violence.

We were thrilled to have Joe Cirincione, President of Ploughshares Fund, talk about the important opportunity we have right now to influence U.S. nuclear policy. Thanks to support from the Ploughshares Fund and to supporters like you, WPSR has been working hard to capitalize on that opportunity. While regrettably we do not have a video of Joe’s remarks at the dinner, you might enjoy this panel discussion that WPSR co-hosted with Ploughshares Fund and the Jackson School at the University of Washington in December. (Joe was joined on the panel by Ben Rhodes, the Deputy National Security Advisor for Strategic Communications and Speechwriting from 2009 to 2017, as well as WPSR’s own Dr. Bruce Amundson and Lilly Adams.)

One of my favorite parts of the evening was getting to present the indomitable Jean Walkinshaw with the 2019 Paul Beeson Peace Award. Dr. Paul Beeson—whose contributions to medicine included authoring two major textbooks and serving as Chair of Medicine at Emory, Yale, and Oxford—was a long-time member of WPSR and an early, passionate opponent of nuclear weapons. He modeled exemplary physician activism by insisting the role of physicians in ensuring a healthier world extended beyond the boundaries of individual patient care.

Jean Walkinshaw’s activism to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons has inspired me personally. As a young woman, Jean joined the Houses for Hiroshima effort, led by UW professor Floyd Schmoe. Jean spent the summer of 1951 building houses in Hiroshima as a means to show American support for a community devastated by our country’s nuclear support. In the 1970’s Jean produced a documentary, Trident: Super Sub or Dinosaur?, that told the story of how nuclear-armed submarines came to Washington. Decades later, she’s still building from those experiences to advocate unceasingly for nuclear disarmament. I feel so lucky to know Jean and to learn from her.

I am thrilled to share that our event netted $110,000. These proceeds will go a long way toward supporting WPSR’s work this year. It is truly amazing what a relatively small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can do together. Thank you again to all of you who attended this event and to everyone who contributed, including our generous event sponsors. WPSR could not do this work without you!