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Initial Findings From World’s First Civilian DU Epidemiological Survey

By Katsumi Furitsu & Doug Weir

The first report from the team of European and Iraqi health professionals who are planning the world’s first civilian DU epidemiological survey has been released.

The survey, which is sponsored by ICBUW and the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW), aims to assess for the first time the extent to which DU pollution in Basrah, southern Iraq, is damaging civilians’ health.

Doctors from Basrah have been presenting powerful evidence of a rise in the number of cases of cancers and birth defects since the mid-1990s. They suspect that the environmental damage from pollutants - including DU contamination - released during the conflicts may be responsible. However, because of a lack of responsibility from coalition forces and the political instability inside Iraq, almost nothing has been done to assess the scale of the problem.

There are many scientific reports and papers based on animal and cellular studies, which have clearly shown that DU can act as a carcinogen; still more papers highlight its ability to damage the reproductive system and foetus, through both radiological action and its chemical toxicity.

However, until now there have been no large-scale epidemiological and environmental surveys into DU exposure and health damage in populations living in contaminated areas. This has ensured that the causal relationship between health problems and DU exposure has not always been clear.

The current survey was first developed following a ‘summer school’ in Jordan last year, where Iraqi health professionals met with European epidemiologists and other specialists. Earlier this year a second meeting took place in Germany. Although still in the planning stages, they have found that the main priority in Basrah is to establish a reliable cancer registry, which can then act as a solid database for a subsequent epidemiological and environmental health analysis.

They have made great steps towards setting it up during the last year. Following the Amman Summer School, doctors and researchers from Basrah established a project team to improve patient care, case detection and registration. They will now map cases and identify possible risk factors and possible environmental pollutants, especially focusing on DU.

They are currently summarising and tidying the raw data on cancer and haematological malignancies (mainly leukemia) from their main three sources in the city. These are: the Al-Sadr Teaching Hospital, the Cancer Registration Section at the Department of Pathology and Forensic Medicine at the College of Medicine and the Paediatrics’ Oncology Ward in Basrah Maternity and Child Hospital. They are also assessing other sources.

So far it seems that breast cancer, lymphomas and some other cancers have clearly been increasing. There are also some kinds of cancers, such as liver cancer, which have decreased or have remained stable during the past ten years.

A formal paper on their work so far will be submitted to a journal later this year and a presentation made at the Third Annual ICBUW Conference in August.
As you may recall from the last issue of Friendly Fire (Issue 1, February 2006), it looked as if Belgium was close to reaching a ban on uranium weapons - the first country in the world to do so. What follows is the latest news on the situation, but first a little reminder of where the Belgian Coalition were up to.

On the 3rd of January 1933, a law was passed in Belgium which banned the possession and trade in certain types of weapons. When the Belgian parliament believes that a new type of weapon system should be banned, this is added to the list of weapons contained in the 1933 law. This law bans various weapons including anti-personnel mines and, since February 2006, also cluster munitions.

After Senator Lionel Vandenberghe had fully adopted an amendment (3-1261/2) from the Belgian Coalition Stop Uraniumwapens to a law proposal introduced by the Senators Sabine de Bethune and Erika Thijs (both CD&V: Dutch speaking Christian Democrats) Sabine de Bethune wrote a new law proposal (3-1593/1) on November 7th 2005. This law proposal, introduced on March 1st 2006, adopted an amendment by Senator Lionel Vandenberghe (SPRIRT: Dutch Speaking Progressive Liberals) which deals exclusively with uranium weapons.

In her justification, Sabine de Bethune says that her proposal is in line with previous political initiatives to ban anti-personnel mines and submunitions which cause superfluous injury to civil populations. “Indeed, in the long-term, weapons containing depleted uranium constitute a huge danger for civilians after the armed conflict has ended. Therefore, Belgium has to be at the forefront of the struggle against the use of weapons with depleted uranium, this by analogy with the worldwide ban on the use of anti-personnel mines.”

Senator de Bethune writes that NATO and the command of the Belgian Army has been covering up the health consequences of the use of uranium weapons. Knowing that 18 countries already possess these weapons, she writes that: “The proliferation has to be put a stop to...there is an urgent need to implement an international treaty”. The term used in her new bill is ‘Weapons and munitions that contain depleted uranium or other industrially manufactured uranium.’ This is the definition proposed by the Belgian Coalition Stop Uraniumwapens. Erika Thijs and Lionel Vandenberghe co-signed her law proposal.

Contrary to the law proposal (51 2199/001) that was introduced by member of the Chamber Dirk Van der Maelen (SPA, Dutch Speaking Social Democrats) de Bethune’s proposal does not mention the dismantling of Belgian uranium weapon arsenals. The President of the House of Representatives Commission on National Defense Mr. Philippe Monfils (MR, French Speaking Liberal Democrats) has promised to have a debate on the issue of Van der Maelen’s law proposal in the second half of June 2006.

On February 20th, 2006, Mr. Dirk Van der Maelen asked the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Karel De Gucht (VLD: Dutch-Speaking Liberal Democrats) whether aircraft containing uranium weapons have used Belgian airspace or landed at Belgian airports. Minister De Gucht answered (QRVA 51 120, doc 2005200607294, 3 May 2006) that: “An inquiry at the Belgian Ministry of Defense reveals that this department did not carry out the transport of weapons and munitions containing depleted uranium.” Minister De Gucht writes: “In this context my services were informed that the Belgian Ministry of Defense has not stored munitions and weapons containing depleted uranium in its installations.”

The Belgian Coalition has been invited by Mr Dirk Van der Maelen to have a talk about timing and strategy for the first discussion in the House Commission on National Defense. At the moment no Hearings or study days for Members of the Chamber are planned. But on Van der Maelen’s request the President of the Commission promised to post the law proposal on the agenda in the second part of June. At the moment no amendments have been added in favour of the Ministry of Defense’s point of view that uranium weapons are safe.

We think most political factions in the House will support a ban, and it is likely that the law proposal will be approved by the House Commission on National Defense. The next step is to gain approval for the proposal at the Plenary session. If that is positive, there will be a law banning uranium weapons in Belgium.

During the Hearing about cluster munitions on December 19th 2005, Mr. Jean-Claude Lacroix, director of the Belgian Security and Defense Industry stated: “First, Belgian industry is not involved in the manufacture of munitions with depleted uranium. In this field the industry leaves the initiative to the parliament,” (doc 51 1935/007, blz. 19). This means that a proposed ban will not be countered with economic arguments claiming that workers will lose jobs in the event of a ban. But to make sure that the French speaking parties will not object on the grounds that a ban would harm the Walloon economy, we have engaged an independent French speaking NGO to submit research making clear that no DU shells are produced in Belgium.

Is Belgium Close To A Ban On Uranium Weapons? Part II

By Willem Van den Panhuysen
On May 11, 2006, the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Department of Defense Authorization Bill which contained an amendment by Jim McDermott that requires a comprehensive study on possible health effects from exposure to depleted uranium (DU) on soldiers and their children. This was a real victory.

Other than this amendment, there are currently several pieces of DU related legislation in the House of Representatives. Including; HR 5303, the Depleted Uranium Munitions Suspension and Study Act of 2006, introduced by Representative Cynthia McKinney without co-sponsors. If passed, HR 5303 would require the suspension of the use, sale, development, production, testing, and export of depleted uranium munitions pending the outcome of certain studies of the health effects of DU munitions.

H.R. 2410, The Depleted Uranium Munitions Act, introduced by Congressman Jim McDermott (D-WA) has to do with health effects of exposure to depleted uranium munitions and requires the clean-up of contaminated sites where DU has been manufactured and test-fired. It currently has 45 co-sponsors.

H.R. 202, The Depleted Uranium Screening and Testing Act of 2005 was introduced by Congressman Jose Serrano (D-NY) and would identify members of the Armed Forces who were exposed to DU and would require testing for DU exposure. The bill has 17 co-sponsors.

Last November, Congressman Bob Filner (D-CA) introduced a bill in the House, H.R. 4184, known as “You Were There, You Get Care Act of 2005”. It would amend title 38 of the United States Code and would provide that veterans of the 1991 Gulf War and subsequent conflicts be considered to be radiation-exposed veterans with regard to “certain diseases and disabilities” acquired during military service. It mentions DU and would require in-depth medical studies independent of the Departments of Defense and Veterans’ Affairs. It is in the House Veterans’ Affairs Committee where it has been referred to the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs. It has just 9 co-sponsors.

Legislation on the state level

Over the past year and a half, 20 different states have initiated legislation that would enable veterans who are members of the National Guard to get tested for depleted uranium exposure. Many of the bills also include provision for the setting up of a health registry. So far legislation in Connecticut and Louisiana has become law. Connecticut is planning to implement the law in the fall of 2006.

In Massachusetts similar legislation, H.B. 4591, “An Act Relative to Exposures to Hazardous Materials by Certain Members of the National Guard" has passed through several committees and may become law before the end of the year. Grassroots Actions for Peace has actively fought for its passage as it has gone through the Committees on Veterans’ Affairs and Healthcare and Finance. Gretel Munroe of Grassroots spoke at the initial hearing held by the Joint Committee on Veterans and Federal Affairs in February. Peggi Konner, aide to Representative Matthew Patrick, who introduced H.B. 4591, told Gretel a week ago that the bill had educated a lot of people.
Given the struggle to bring a depleted uranium ban, and our respective Draft Convention, onto the playing field of the international community, ICBUW has drafted another text in the form of a resolution for the United Nations General Assembly. The new draft is aimed at awareness raising and is intended to trigger activity and discussion on the depleted uranium issue. This is necessary to overcome a deadlock that has arisen at the level of the UN. Couched in cautious and reasonable terms, this might be a quite successful move even in view of the current situation of deaf ears towards depleted uranium weapons.

Content of the resolution

Because of the sensitivity of the issue, the draft resolution is guided by the prevailing political context and asks for small, yet realistic steps. First of all, due to the unclear information on the use of DU weapons in Afghanistan and Kosovo, the regional dimension is limited to the use of such weapons, *inter alia*, in Kuwait and southern Iraq in 1991, and in Iraq again since March 2003. Secondly, in its essence, the resolution recalls the statements of the IAEA, WHO and UNEP that more research is needed on the immediate or long term health or environmental effects of depleted uranium weapons.

In this regard the draft text requests independent field studies of sites in Iraq targeted with DU weapons. It asks the Secretary-General to seek the views of States and relevant international organisations and to submit a report thereon to the General Assembly. Meanwhile states are urged to refrain, in line with the precautionary principle, from the operational use of such weapons. Furthermore, it invites States and international organisations to study our Draft Convention and present reports on the *International Day for Preventing the Exploitation of the Environment in War and Armed Conflict*.

Lessons from the past

Besides the developments on a national level, e.g. parliamentary initiatives in Belgium, court decisions in the UK (*see: Friendly Fire, Issue 1*), lower UN bodies have dealt with the issue quite successfully. The Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities adopted two resolutions on the issue in 1996 and 1997. The UN Secretary General in 2002 pointed in a speech on the occasion of the *International Day* at the possible inhumane and indiscriminate effects of weapons containing depleted uranium. But most interesting of all is a draft resolution on the effects of the use of depleted uranium, which was introduced to the General Assembly First Committee on Disarmament and International Security in October 2001. Even though the resolution was put forward by Iraq under the then Saddam regime, and later failed, it was approved within the Committee by a slight majority of states (49). This record firstly shows that there is an interest in the issue, and secondly, that a resolution might be successful if introduced by another, more “neutral” state. Thirdly, a new resolution might get through if linked to more substantive issues like calling for investigations and introducing a draft instrument.

Partners and timetable

The most essential job in pushing our initiative forward is finding partners, and especially a leading country to introduce the resolution as a sub item in the UN GA First Committee at its annual session. While the European Parliament issued last November, for the third time, a call for a moratorium on the use of depleted uranium munitions, most of the EU Member States are sceptical on the issue.

The larger EU states in particular are afraid of any confrontation with the US government. However, Belgium, as noted before, and also Finland might be potential candidates for introducing a resolution. In the meantime, the Belgian ICBUW Coalition has presented the draft resolution project to their Foreign Ministry.

Outside the EU, Norway, New Zealand and Mexico might be sympathetic to the issue. Lobbying these countries will be the main task for the next few months. Moreover, we are, once again, trying to place the issue on the agenda of other UN and international community fora. The fourth *International Day for Preventing the Exploitation of the Environment in War and Armed Conflict* is another option to campaign for this important but politically difficult issue.

ICBUW is going to prepare a special report that will be presented to the UN on the International Day, and, once again we are planning to hold a workshop event in Geneva in November, to coincide with the Review Conference for the UN Conventional Weapons Convention.

To learn more about the draft resolution (overleaf) please visit our website: www.bandepleteduranium.org. For more information on the International Day of Action in November please contact Doug Weir at info@cadu.org.uk.
Draft Resolution

Concerns About Weapons Containing Depleted Uranium

The General Assembly,

Concerned about the widespread existence and use of weapons containing depleted uranium,

Taking into consideration the potential harmful effects of the use of such weapons to human health and the environment,

Recalling the use of such weapons, inter alia, in Kuwait and southern Iraq in 1991, and in Iraq again since March 2003,

Noting that post-conflict assessments conducted by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) in the Balkans, in collaboration with IAEA and WHO, concluded that more research was needed on how the dust from depleted uranium weapons affects the environment,

Recalling the UN Secretary-General’s speech on the occasion of the International Day for Preventing the Exploitation of the Environment in War and Armed Conflict (Nov 6th 2002), stating that “although international conventions govern nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, new technologies, such as depleted uranium ammunition, threaten the environment”,

Referring to resolutions 1996/16 and 1997/36 adopted by the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities expressing the belief that continued efforts must be undertaken to sensitise public opinion to the inhumane and indiscriminate effects of weapons like those containing depleted uranium and to the need for their complete elimination.

1. Supports UNEP’s request for an independent environmental field study of sites in Iraq targeted with weapons containing depleted uranium.

2. Urges States, in line with the precautionary principle, to refrain from the operational use of such weapons until it is scientifically established that such use causes no serious immediate or long-term health or environmental effects, and has no indiscriminate effects on civilians.

3. Invites States and relevant international organizations to study the Draft Convention on the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling, transfer and use of uranium weapons and on their destruction (see Annex), and to present reports on the issue in the frame of the International Day for Preventing the Exploitation of the Environment in War and Armed Conflict (November 6th).

4. Requests the Secretary-General to seek the views of States and relevant international organizations on all aspects of the effects of the use of weapons containing depleted uranium and to submit a report thereon to the General Assembly at its [61st] session.

Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its [one of its next sessions / 61st] session an item entitled “Concerns about weapons containing depleted uranium”.

Uranium Mining’s Legacy And Future In Asia
By Doug Weir

As we reported last issue (February 2006), the sudden resurgence in interest in nuclear power has caused a huge rise in global uranium prices. It is also clear that the planned increase in the use of nuclear power will encourage states to find alternative uses for depleted uranium waste. Expensive and hazardous to store, the use of waste DU in civilian and military applications is likely to become more attractive.

But the constant, and often ignored back story to the nuclear energy debate, is the environmental and social effects of uranium mining. Across the world indigenous communities are suffering from toxic and radioactive pollution caused by the careless mining, processing and dumping of mine wastes and uranium products.

Uranium mining is a major worldwide industry. In 2004, about 50 mines in 16 countries produced more than 40,000 tonnes of uranium. Business is booming, according to the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development’s Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA), which has 28 industrialised countries as members. In a report published on 1st June it says that uranium production increased 11 per cent between 2002 and 2004, and has the potential to double by 2010 to feed new nuclear reactors.

Although the fight against the expansion of uranium mines in Australia and the US is well documented, major reserves lie in other areas, in countries with far laxer environmental standards and poorer economic conditions.

Legacy in the ‘Stans’

During the Soviet Union’s Cold War arms race with the US, large deposits of uranium were discovered and subsequently exploited in what are now the former Soviet republics of Kazakhstan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan. Between them the ‘Stans’ have more than 900,000 tonnes of reasonably assured and inferred resources, of which Kazakhstan has the lion’s share.

In Kyrgyzstan, the situation is particularly dire, with dozens of poorly constructed tailings ponds in a geologically unstable area. Recently, problems in the Minkush area have been highlighted by the OSCE. The area contains dumps and waste from mining undertaken between 1958 to 1969 that pose a threat to the environment of the Naryn region and the fertile Fergana valley. The region is also threatened by landslides. A radioactive dump near the Tuuk-Suu River risks being flooded if a landslide blocks the river, while heavy rain and snowfall in 2003-2005 contributed to the triggering of landslides. "The climate and the earthquake situation in the past 10 years have created conditions that could trigger landslides, which result in mudslides and catastrophic floods," said Bakir Jolchiev, Kyrgyz Deputy Minister of Emergency Situations.

Landslides aside, hazards from tailings dumps include direct exposure to radon gas and gamma radiation from poorly capped deposits; groundwater pollution from heavy metals such as arsenic that are often found in the same deposits as uranium; and exposure to toxic and radioactive dusts blown from the surface of tailings ponds. In the ‘Stans’ there has been concern over the grazing of livestock on abandoned workings and the pollution of groundwater. A recent study by Belgian and Kyrgyz scientists has found that villagers in some areas are receiving radiation doses up to 40 times the internationally recommended safety limit, mostly from the food they grow.

Legacy in India

A different arms race, this time between India and Pakistan, has left, and continues to leave, an all too familiar legacy. Last month the BBC reported on the health problems associated with the extraction of India’s Jadugoda uranium deposit in the eastern state of Jharkhand. The complex on the site is also now a dump for nuclear waste from across India.

More than 50 of the village’s children are ill with undiagnosed wasting diseases, yet in 2004, and in spite of compelling evidence linking these health problems with contamination from the mine, the Supreme Court of India dismissed a Public Interest Litigation against the mine’s operators, the Uranium Corporation of India Limited.

The BBC reported seeing villagers digging for water barely a stone’s throw from one of site’s tailings dams - behind which lies millions of tons of slurry and waste from uranium mines - while villagers use streams and rivers, polluted from the complex’s outflow to wash vegetables and clothes. There are no signs to warn of contamination. In 2001, it was found that the external gamma dose rate exceeds 1 mSv/y in the villages, reaching 10 mSv/y around the tailing ponds, with the soil surrounding them heavily contaminated by uranium. Particularly high contamination levels were found in the village of Dungridih that borders one of the ponds, and waste rock from the mine has been used for construction. In Jadugoda, the political sensitivity of India’s fledgling nuclear industry means that human rights come second to economic growth.

Thanks to WISE for Asian uranium data: www.wise-uranium.org
The 3rd ICBUW International Conference
Hiroshima, August 3rd-6th, 2006

The International Coalition to Ban Uranium Weapons

“Raising our voices together with those of the victims for the total abolition of DU weapons”

The International Coalition to Ban Uranium Weapons is to hold its 3rd Annual Conference this August in Hiroshima, Japan. We are planning to invite victims from DU-affected areas, veterans exposed to battlefield DU, as well as scientists, politicians and journalists to present their latest findings and views on the DU problem. In doing so we hope to increase our understanding of these toxic, radioactive weapons and highlight the urgent, global nature of this danger that threatens us all.

We extend this invitation to all concerned. Please come to Hiroshima and unite your voice with ours to strengthen our demand for immediate measures for the victims and a total, explicit, and effective ban on DU weapons. Let’s send a powerful message from Hiroshima, the symbol of radiological disaster.

Conference Objectives:
To raise our voices together with those of the victims for a total ban on DU weapons.
To clarify the scientific and legal issues that are critical for the campaign’s success.
To map out further campaign strategies toward a total ban on uranium weapons (including research and compensation issues).

Times, Schedule & Locations:
August 3rd: Plenary meeting (Hiroshima International Conference Center)
am Opening Session
pm Session 1: Damage Panel-1/ Iraq
   Session 2: Damage Panel-2/ USA

August 4th: Plenary meeting (Hiroshima International Conference Center)
am Session 3: Science-1
pm Session 4: Damage Panel-3/ Europe
   Session 5: Campaign-1/ Asia-Pacific Area

August 5th: Workshops and meetings co-organized with friend-organisations .
(Hiroshima City Plaza: simultaneous interpretation)
am Special Session: Meeting with Hibakusha (A-bomb survivors)
pm Session 6: Campaign-2/ Towards the realisation of a Ban Treaty
   Session 7: Science-2 (in English only)
   Session 8: Campaign-3/ Support for Victims

August 6th: Plenary Session (Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum)
pm Closing Session (consecutive interpretation)

Participants
Among more than 30 people who have already agreed to come from abroad are:

From the Middle East:
Dr. Jawad Al-Ali: (Iraq) Director of the Cancer Center, Basra Teaching Hospital. ICBUW science counsellor.
Dr. Souad Al-Azzawi: (Iraq) Vice-President of Mamoun University of Scientific Affairs; former professor of environmental engineering at Baghdad Univ., recipient of the 2003 Nuclear-Free Future Award for her work on environmental contamination after the Gulf War in Iraq.
Mr. Khajak Varnatian: (Iraq) Physicist, Basrah Environmental Department, engaged in measuring the DU contamination in Basra, and now involved in a NGO concerned about environmental contaminations caused by wars.
Mr. Najib Saab: (Lebanon) Editor-in-chief of the Arabic magazine, Environment and Development. Received the United Nations Environment Award in 2003.

From the USA:
Dr. Rosalie Bertell: founder of IICPH - International Institute of Concern for Public Health; recipient of the Right Livelihood Award 1986. ICBUW science counsellor.
Sister Eileen White: long-time campaigner against nuclear weapons: Dr. Bertell’s companion.
From Central America:

Mr. Damacio Lopez: (Costa Rica) : IDUST Used to live near a DU testing range in New Mexico, USA. One of the founders of the ICBUW campaign.

From Europe:

Dr. Keith Baverstock (Finland): Professor of Environmental Sciences, University of Kuopio; Former Senior Research Adviser, WHO’s Radiation Section.

Ray Bristow (UK): A Gulf-War veteran suffering from DU exposure. In 2004, he brought into question the British Army’s “DU InformationCard” issued only to its own soldiers deployed in southern Iraq.

Ms. Paola Melone (Italy): widow of the Italian veteran, Stefano Melone.

Captain Filippo Montaperto (Italy): Captain of the Italian Army, and a specialist in the removal of unexploded ordnance. Affected with a lymphoma after working in Bosnia for six months. Member of Osservatorio Militare (Military Watch).

Dr. Antonietta Gatti (Italy): Modena Univ. nanodiagnostic. Examined some of the sick veterans who served in the Balkans.

Dr. Stefano Montinari (Italy): Modena Univ. nanodiagnostics. A collaborator of Dr. Gatti

Ms. Stefania Divertito (Italy): journalist, news editor for the national daily METRO and winner of the 2004 “Journalist of The Year” Award in Italy for her articles on depleted uranium.

Ms. Yukari Saito (Italy): translator. Italy-Japan Information Center in Pisa.

From the Asia-Pacific Area:

Dr. Rachel Darken (Australia): Vice President. MAPW - Medical Association for the Prevention of War; IPPNW’s International Councillor.

Mr David Bradbury: (Australia) Documentary director. His latest film Blowin’ In The Wind looks at some of the health issues surrounding the Shoalwater Bay training facility in Australia and the effects of depleted uranium in theatres of war.

Naturally, many Japanese specialists and campaigners will also participate. In addition, Mr. Tadatoshi Akiba, Mayor of Hiroshima, has agreed to give an opening address, and Ms. Nassrine Azimi, Director of the Hiroshima Office for Asia and the Pacific of UNITAR (United Nations Institute for Training and Research) is to participate.

Among the ICBUW members expected to participate are:

Manfred Mohr (Germany: IALANA-Germany); Rae Street (Great Britain: CADU); Tara Thornton (USA: Maine Coalition for Endangered Species); Gretel Munroe (USA: Grassroots Actions for Peace); Ria Verjauw (Belgium: representative of the Belgian Coalition to Stop Uranium Weapons); Francesco Iannuzelli (Italy: Peace Link); Dr. Heike Schroeder (Germany: Social Medicine and Epidemiology, Univ. of Bremen); Doug Weir (Great Britain: CADU).

Host groups:

NO DU Hiroshima Project (http://www.nodu-hiroshima.org/)
Campaign Against Radiation Exposure (CARE), and the Japanese groups in support of ICBUW.

ICBUW’s mission:

In an “International Appeal to Ban the Use of Depleted Uranium Weapons” drafted in 1997 by Ramsey Clark, Former US Attorney General, it reads:

“Depleted-uranium weapons are an unacceptable threat to life, a violation of international law and an assault on human dignity. To safeguard the future of humanity, we call for an unconditional international ban forbidding research, manufacture, testing, transportation, possession and use of DU for military purposes.” (Depleted Uranium Metal of Dishonor, revised edition, 1999, p.21)

This is a very concise, unambiguous text that shows the compatibility of “clearly recognizing the illegality of certain weapons,” on the one hand, and “aiming for their ban,” on the other; or, to put it more positively, the legitimacy of, and the need for, an explicit ban to weapons considered “illegal.” (Metal of Dishonor also includes Ramsey Clark’s article entitled simply, “Ban Depleted Uranium Weapons.”) It is precisely in such a vein that, while confirming the illegality of the use of such weapons, ICBUW is striving for a specific treaty banning DU weapons. We are inspired by previous treaties banning biological and chemical weapons and landmines that have all proved successful. Furthermore, as the antipersonnel landmine treaty has shown, a DU ban treaty would have an immense, legal and political significance even if certain countries would not sign it.

Contacts:

Nobuo Kazashi (ICBUW Coordinator of the Asian-Pacific region). Email: horizons@cc22.ne.jp
Haruko Moritaki (Secretary-General, NO DU Hiroshima Project). Email: haruko-m@f3.dion.ne.jp
Katsumi Furitsu (ICBUW Board Member) Email:f-katsumi@titan.ocn.ne.jp
Doug Weir (CADU). Email: office@cadu.org.uk