

The Political and Public Campaign for Global Zero

GLOBAL ZERO SUMMIT

Savoy Hotel
London, UK
June 21-23, 2011

***AN OBSTACLE TO ELIMINATION
OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS***

***Jennifer Allen Simons, CM, Ph.D., LL.D.
President,
The Simons Foundation***

Good Afternoon!

My name is Jennifer Allen Simons. I am President of The Simons Foundation, Founding Partner and Principal Sponsor of Global Zero, and Principal Sponsor of this Summit.

First of all, I would like to express my appreciation, and the appreciation of Co-Founders Bruce Blair, Matt Brown and the Global Zero team, to John and Jessica Fullerton for their leadership support; to Bob and Ellie Meyers, and Ray Frankel, who are here representing the World Security Institute, which hosts and is a sponsor of Global Zero; and to the Ploughshares Fund for their generous support, represented here by Kelly Bronk. Their contributions have provided the Global Zero team with the opportunity to pursue the programme as envisioned in the plan.

In order to fully implement the plan, at the pace we believe is necessary to achieve the Global Zero goals, within the timeframe established, we need to increase our funding base. So any contribution that any of you can make, or any contacts that you can provide to help Global Zero secure the optimum financial base, would be truly appreciated.

My task today is to introduce the new Global Zero campaign. But first, I would like to say a few words about one of the obstacles which may impede the road to zero nuclear weapons.

The discord between Russia, and the United States and NATO, on missile defence is reaching alarming proportions. Tensions have risen to such a level that it may put an end to the plan to eliminate nuclear weapons.

The issue has been festering for many years. But tensions were ameliorated when President Obama modified the US plan; and NATO and Russia came to an agreement to partner in the development of the missile defence. However, with NATO's recent announcement that NATO would adopt the US 4-Phase plan; and NATO's subsequent proposal to Russia which calls for two separate systems – a Russian and a NATO – has caused an outcry in Russia. My understanding is that there are also differing perspectives among NATO members on the partnership proposal.

Fifteen months ago, in March 2010, - in a speech at the Brussels Forum - NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen proposed to bridge the divide in Europe, to fulfil – to quote him - the “goal of a Europe whole, free and at peace.” His plan was to unite Russia and NATO in a single missile defence - a new Euro-Atlantic security architecture: “One security roof”, he said - built together, supported together and operated together, and the “people from Vancouver to Vladivostok would know that they were part of one community.”¹

¹NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen *Building a Euro-Atlantic Security Architecture*, Brussels Forum March 27th 2010

Russia's proposal for a missile defence is close to this - calling for a full and equal partnership – a single system - one entity but covering two sectors – NATO's and Russia's with the intention of a joint response to missile threats.²

Fifteen months after Fogh Rasmussen's call for missile defence as a concrete means for uniting Europe, he announced NATO's intention to adopt the United States plan for the four-phase adapted approach Missile Defence to be completed by 2020.³ And proposed, to Russia, a partnership of two separate independent systems which would be capable of cooperation and exchange. Rather than uniting Europe, this has created a huge divide, building on the already growing discord between the United States and Russia on the issue of missile defence.⁴

The fact that the United States is forging bilateral agreements to host missile defence receptors in countries bordering on Russia is causing distress in Moscow because they say, first of all, the United States commitment that Russia would have a role in planning the system has been ignored; and secondly, the United States has refused Russia's request to provide "legally-binding guarantees that its plans for a European defence system would not be directed against Russia."⁵

Actually, the missile defence system may not work. Acknowledged US missile defence experts, Dr. Theodore Postol, and Dr. Yousaf Butt believe that "third and fourth Phases of the four-phased Adaptive Approach" will provide "little or no combat effectiveness." However, they say, it may "still cause ... Russian planners to treat them as if they might work." Moreover, they continue, the third and fourth phases may "constitute an infringement upon the parity set down in the New START."⁶

The current impasse between Russia, and the United States and NATO, is an obstacle of

² Anatoly Antonov, Deputy Defence Minister, Russia, *Ria Novosti*, May 13/11

³ ***Missile Defence –Phased Adaptive Approach***

Phase One (in the 2011 timeframe) – Deploy current and proven missile defense systems available in the next two years, including the sea-based Aegis Weapon System, the SM-3 interceptor (Block IA), and sensors such as the forward-based Army Navy/Transportable Radar Surveillance system (AN/TPY-2), to address regional ballistic missile threats to Europe and our deployed personnel and their families;

Phase Two (in the 2015 timeframe) – After appropriate testing, deploy a more capable version of the SM-3 interceptor (Block IB) in both sea- and land-based configurations, and more advanced sensors, to expand the defended area against short- and medium-range missile threats;

Phase Three (in the 2018 timeframe) – After development and testing are complete, deploy the more advanced SM-3 Block IIA variant currently under development, to counter short-, medium-, and intermediate-range missile threats; and

Phase Four (in the 2020 timeframe) – After development and testing are complete, deploy the SM-3 Block IIB to help better cope with medium- and intermediate-range missiles and the potential future ICBM threat to the United States.

⁴ Defense News, May/11

⁵ Ria Novosti, May 26/11

⁶ www.fas.org/press/news/2011/missile_defense__shield.html

growing proportions to nuclear disarmament.

President Medvedev has expressed concern that the US/NATO missile defence could undermine Russia's nuclear deterrent and has warned that it could cause a new arms race. He has also warned that Russia may withdraw from the START treaty. And he has threatened that the impasse may block future arms reductions. It seems that President Medvedev is prepared to walk off into Never-Never land. The issue, he says, will be resolved after 2020 – after the completion date of the fourth phase.

Twenty-five years ago, in Reykjavík, it was also missile defence – the United States Strategic Defence Initiative - which caused Presidents Reagan and Gorbachev to walk away from each other.⁷

We cannot let this happen again! We cannot lose another opportunity to achieve a nuclear free world.

It is imperative that Global Zero finds a way to overcome this obstacle so that nothing impedes the elimination of the world's nuclear arsenals - that nothing impedes the progress set forth in the Global Zero Action Plan to eliminate nuclear weapons by 2030.

In this room we have a wealth of intelligence, expertise, diplomatic skills and experience in these issues. And I call on you to find - and to work for - a solution to this impasse, so that we can continue on our path to Global Zero within the 2030 timeframe.

My only proposal to the missile defence impasse is a long-term one - to revisit the elimination and ban of missiles. We can not continue to spend the world's money on military dreams, *humans' nightmares*, and hardware that puts human life at such risk. It is welcome news that the delivery systems – launchers and ballistic missiles - for both nuclear and conventional weapons are counted in the New START. This is a beginning! However, one thousand, four hundred of these missiles will still be deployed. And, as well, some thirty other states either have missile capabilities, or are developing them and expanding their range.

It is time to revisit **Reykjavík** where President Reagan proposed to eliminate all offensive ballistic missiles within 10 years. This proposal though, went nowhere. It was part of the bargain to implement the Strategic Defence Initiative and was merely to delay for 10 years, the deployment of the SDI system.

The most economical way to solve the Missile Defence problem is to eliminate and ban missiles. ***I am not naïve.*** Militarism in our capitalist society is more about economics, about accumulating wealth - about greed - than it is about protecting human beings from real threats. ***I am*** an idealist with my hope for a better world.

And I am also a ***realist*** – realist enough to know that we cannot continue on this upward path of spiralling research, development, manufacture, sales and deployment of weapons.

⁷ George Schultz Memoirs, www.margaretthatcher.org/document/1110620

We cannot continue in this upward spiral of military expenditures. Even during the recent financial crisis military spending continued to rise, as did sales of military equipment. Despite the *current* precarious financial situation, the 2011 global military budget continues this upward rise. The world is flirting with bankruptcy.

Our human security needs are being starved. Funds are necessary to ameliorate the new environmental conditions brought about by climate change, especially with regard to our shrinking food supply. Our social services, our medical systems and our educational systems are suffering from deprivation. And our major cities in developed countries are beginning to resemble Dickensian London.

On this note, I will stop and ask Matt Brown, Co-Founder of Global Zero and the moderator of this panel, to make some preliminary remarks about Global Zero's campaign, and to introduce the panellists.

Thank you very much!

Jennifer Allen Simons, CM, Ph.D., LL.D
President,
The Simons Foundation

June 22, 2011