

Ahmet Yalcinkaya *

The right to be a nuclear power

In our youth, we were filled with stories of a potential war between the United States and the Soviet Union. A long time has passed after the collapse of the Soviet Union, resulting in the fears to have changed. Now, we are continuously being filled with new stories.

The main argument why the expected war never occurred was mainly based on the nuclear weapons possessed by both of the superpowers, which caused them to fear each other. I will not analyze the strength of that argument. It may be partially true with some other parameters being equivalently effective in having avoided a war for decades. What I want to emphasize is the chain of contradictions concerning nuclear arms in concern with human rights and world peace.

Countries possessing nuclear weapons today are the United States, Russia, China, France, UK, India, Pakistan, North Korea, and Israel. Although Israel did not declare its weapons, it is not a secret that it possesses some. Formerly, Kazakhstan, Belarus, Ukraine, and South Africa also possessed nuclear weapons, but they gave them up which can be seen as a really appreciable behavior of them in favor of humanity.

Anybody following the world agenda would easily notice that nuclear weapons of some of those countries are welcomed whereas that of some others are always discussed. Does anybody want me to believe that it is for sake of world peace or the future of human being? Is the weapon of North Korea or Pakistan dangerous, but that of the US or Russia harmless? The actual reason is the desire of having the tools to control others with the least effort, and nothing else. I can understand the ambitions of countries and politicians to some extent although I do not agree, but really cannot understand how some journalists or writers are able to follow the same route. As writers, should we not be so courageous to wish for everyone what we wish for ourselves?

In recent articles and news in the media, nuclear weapons of Pakistan are discussed a lot. Many journalists and politicians hope India to take precautions against the potential threat of Pakistan. If you look at the case superficially, it seems logical as the authors fear the weapons to fall into wrong hands, and point out especially the Taliban to be such a potential.

I do not support the Taliban, but was it not a product of the United States? The Taliban members as religious students may have been educated in Pakistan or somewhere else, but as a movement, was Taliban not created or at least supported by the US to overthrow the Mujahedeen, and especially Ahmad Shah Masood? It is difficult for me to understand why Pakistan would be dangerous but India would not.

Weapons in the hands of wrong powers is, of course, a nightmare for the mankind. But, can anybody guarantee or prove what the “wrong hand” is? You cannot trust the Taliban, the leaders of North Korea or Pakistani leaders, but can you trust Bush, Putin, Sarkozy or the Chinese, British and Israeli leaders? Can anyone guarantee that they are reliable?

An obvious example of the danger in the Middle East should have been noticed during the Israeli attack in Ghaza. As if the massacre in the Ghaza strip was not sufficient, a candidate of prime minister ship in Israel had called with imperturbableness to use nuclear weapons against the Palestinians in Ghaza. It was foolish, of course, but he did call for it. Until now, I have never seen any country discussing Israel's nuclear weapons, except some Arab and Muslim states.

A honest wish would not be to discuss whether Pakistan, North Korea or any other country should possess nuclear weapons or not, but would be to wish a nuclear-free world and call for removing all nuclear weapons from the world. In this regard, for example, it is absurd to discuss or criticize the efforts of Iran to develop nuclear power. Iran promises at least that it will not develop weapons, but just the power for its industry. You may be suspicious about the promise, but is it fair to make a big fuss of a doubt when you never criticize an obvious threat such as the example above? No, the reason is something else.

It is a struggle for power. Countries with nuclear weapons do not want rivals. I can bear it if they could admit, but if anybody wants to make fools of us using masks like "humanity", "wrong hands", "danger" etc., it is really unbearable. Nobody can convince me that US, UK, France, Russia, China and Israel should have nuclear arms, and Pakistan, North Korea, Iran or any other country should have not to protect the world or to have peace. Were the stories of the Soviet era big lies?

I believe that either everybody has the right to have nuclear weapons or nobody should have. Otherwise, the "law of the jungle", will always be in force everywhere. My wish is a nuclear-free world, but if this opportunity is provided for some, others should have it, too. If not possessing weapons, everybody should have the right to be a nuclear power, at least for peaceful technological means.

May 20th, 2009

** Professor, consultant and freelance writer*