

would currently regard as the reasons for their current work.

For instance NHS staff would be required to clear beds of people who are fit enough in order to make room for the casualties of war. Local government staff, many of whom are committed to the idea of working for a democratic government, would be required to administer a non-elected undemocratic government. The police, many of whom still think of themselves as guardians of the public, would be required to protect a privileged minority from what is left of the public who may well feel that they have an equal right to remaining stocks of food and fuel. Firefighters would be unlikely to survive long enough to participate in a post-holocaust government: they tend to be based in centres of population which would be targets.

This is what is planned. The reality is that very few would survive the immediate effects of the weapons. The nuclear winter and the unfiltered rays of the sun will finish off most of the rest. No one at all would be able to live on a planet where we can't grow food.

These 'plans' are tried out in government civil defence exercises periodically. The purpose of these exercises can only be a way of accustoming people to the idea that we could fight and survive a nuclear war and are therefore a way of justifying our possessing them. But possessing them makes it possible that a nuclear war might happen, perhaps even by accident. We are facing a gruesome annihilation for the sake of foolish and barbarous illusions of being a world power.

## THE REALITY

In their book *Crucible of Despair: the Effects of Nuclear War*, Anthony Tucker (Science Correspondent of the Guardian) and Dr J Gleisner conclude:

'Seen in its detail—the systematic and deliberate underplaying of weapons' effects in such government publications as exist—and the highly misleading fudging of the essential distinction between valid emergency planning for civil disasters and "Home Defence", the government's approach has been insidious and deliberately designed to mislead. The recent spate of "planning" instructions from central government is indistinguishable from policy propaganda.'

They add that any government has a duty to prepare for emergencies and such preparations are worthy and to be supported, but 'if we pretend that these services can provide protection or succour in the event of a nuclear war then we will be guilty, with the government, of the cruellest deceptions ever imposed on the people of the world.'



Joanne O'Brien/Format

Caring for people is what most people join the nursing profession for. This picture shows how important the nursing profession is. In the event of a war many hospital beds will be evacuated to make room for casualties.

## WHAT YOU CAN DO

This broadsheet can only touch the surface of the issue of nuclear war and civil defence. A great deal has been written and your Union itself will have material, based on your Union's policy on this subject.

Although many people are now familiar with the government's *Protect and Survive* handbook, it is well worth looking at it if only to see the absurdities in it. When you compare the information in this broadsheet on the effects of nuclear weapons with the advice given in *Protect and Survive* you will see how dishonest their policy is.

## FOR MORE INFORMATION

For more information on Civil Defence exercises and on the regulations covering Civil Defence contact CND at  
22-24 Underwood St  
London N1 7JG  
01-250 4010

or ask your Union.  
This bulletin was written by Duncan Campbell and Kelvin Hopkins.

TUCND, 22-24 Underwood St, London N1 7JG.  
Designed and typeset by Spencers 01-251 8845.  
Printed by Ace, 145 Goldsmiths Row, London E2.

# NUCLEAR WAR GAMES

10549  
NUPE, NALGO, TGWU COHSE,

GMBATU, TU CND, FBU

For us as public service workers, in the health and fire services and with local councils, the choice is clear: either we take part in the Government's Civil Defence charades — planning post holocaust menus, evacuating hospitals and running exercises in underground control centres — or we explain clearly to fellow workers and the public the reality that our emergency services could not cope with even a limited nuclear attack.

NO  
THANKS





Jenny Matthews/Format

## CIVIL DEFENCE AND YOUR GOVERNMENT

THE GOVERNMENT suggests that its new civil defence provisions would protect people in the event of a nuclear war. It argues that the United Kingdom should take precautions to protect its civilian population from the effects of nuclear war. But what are the realistic chances of a nuclear war being 'survived'? Or are the Government's new regulations merely designed to delude people into believing that nuclear war can be fought and 'won'?

## WHAT ARE THE EFFECTS OF A NUCLEAR WAR?

**Physical Damage:** A ten megaton bomb, which is roughly the size of many of the

weapons targeted on Britain, leaves 'a crater 240 feet deep and a half to one mile across with a huge rim of piled wreckage for up to twice that distance.' Government Civil Defence plans are based on the assumption that one megaton bombs will be used on us. The bomb dropped on Hiroshima was 14 kilotons. One megaton is 1000 kilotons.

The government estimates that 200 megatons would be used on us. This is less than 3% of the Soviet Union's known nuclear arsenal.

Even on the government's ridiculously low estimates of what will be used against us, it is difficult to believe that anything will be left of our towns and cities or the people who lived in them.

**Flash:** A ten megaton bomb on London would produce a flash intense enough to burn someone's eyes out in Birmingham and blind someone looking south in Newcastle.

**Fire storms:** After a nuclear attack, fire

Nurses working to help ease an old man's pain.

storms consume all combustible material and oxygen in the bombed area. Large areas not destroyed by the blast will be engulfed by fire. A ten megaton bomb would produce a fire ball three miles in diameter.

**Radiation:** 25% of all the deaths resulting from the Hiroshima bomb were due to radiation. For some, it took 25 years before they died. Lord Carver has said—and many doctors agree with him—that it would be better not to survive a nuclear war.

**Nuclear winter:** Even if only a small number of nuclear weapons were used they would produce what has come to be known as the Nuclear Winter. Gigantic clouds of smoke would be created, so dense that the temperature on the earth

would drop to around -20°C, which would last for six weeks. The ozone layer in the earth's atmosphere would be destroyed, allowing through to the earth harmful rays currently filtered out of sunlight by the ozone layer. This would mean that as the clouds cleared, the unfiltered sunlight would kill plant and animal life.

In short, for the majority of us, a nuclear war—even a 'limited' one—would mean death or terrible injury or illness.

## WHAT WOULD HAPPEN TO SURVIVORS?

A few shelters and bunkers have been built for small groups of local administrators who would control the distribution of food stocks and the disposal of the dead. (People in their own private shelters would be unlikely to survive the shock waves passing through the earth after the explosion, unless their shelters were massively constructed.)

Survivors would be subject to government by regional commissioners in eleven War Emergency regions. These commissioners would have the power to order executions for offences as they saw fit. Democratic government would be abolished at a stroke.

One of the effects of a nuclear explosion would be a massive electromagnetic pulse (EMP) which would burn out electrical circuits including transistors and microchips. Radios and telephones which had survived the physical effects of the blast would almost certainly be destroyed by the EMP. Communications would be virtually destroyed.

## CIVIL DEFENCE AND THE LAW

This Government planned a number of Civil Defence exercises in the early 1980s. The intention was to promote the delusion that there could be survivors who—after a period of disruption—would carry on leading a reasonable life.

Many local authorities believed that these exercises were dishonest in that they suggested to people that the effects of nuclear war were not as horrifying as scientists have said it would be. Many local authorities therefore refused to co-operate, saying that it would be hypocritical of them to do so and suggesting that they were merely being asked to take part in a propaganda exercise. In 1982 the Government's proposed Hard Rock exercise had to be



This firefighter, pictured with her daughter, believes in her union's policy which is of non-cooperation with this government's Civil Defence exercises. She believes in helping save life and not in helping start a nuclear war.

cancelled because of lack of local authority co-operation. This led the government to introduce new civil defence regulations to try and force the authorities to participate in nuclear war games.

Subsequently the 1986 Local Government Act was introduced, restraining local authorities from publishing allegedly 'political' material. This has had the effect of making illegal much local authority material explaining their opposition to the new Civil Defence Regulations.

However, Trade Unions and local peace organisations have been continuing to produce information opposing the civil defence regulations and their new powers.

Government advice through their handbook *Protect and Survive*, has been thoroughly discredited and Trade Unions will continue to expose this dishonesty.

## PUBLIC SERVICE WORKERS AND NUCLEAR WAR

The proposals that this government have drawn up to fight a nuclear war include a great deal of participation from public service staff. Essentially they would be required to do things which would be directly contrary to much of what we