

**Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs**

The Hague, the Netherlands  
April 17<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup>, 2009

***Nuclear Weapons - Preparing the Ground for Zero  
Nuclear Disarmament Beyond the NPT***

***Jennifer Allen Simons, Ph.D., LL.D.***

Good Afternoon,

First I would like to thank Pugwash President, Amb. Jayantha Dhanapala; Secretary-General Prof. Paolo Cotta-Ramusino; Prof. Georg Frerks, Chair of Netherlands Pugwash, and the organizers for inviting me to participate in this conference. I also want to commend Pugwash for its contribution to making a better world.

I am pleased that an entire day of the Conference is devoted to Nuclear Disarmament because we have entered into unprecedented epoch of hope, of beneficial change, a time when the elimination of nuclear weapons is at its most likely prospect with the Presidents of the United States and Russia - the two states possessing 96% of the world's nuclear weapons - having committed their countries to achieving a nuclear free world.

I note that Canada is in parentheses after my name on the Agenda, so I imagine that I ought to be speaking from a Canadian perspective. But I believe I am representative of a community larger than one country. I am a citizen of Canada. I am also, by birth, a citizen of Australia; and because my father was born in England, I am a UK citizen and therefore a member of the European Community. Because of these countries memberships in NATO and ANZUS, I am under two nuclear umbrellas, umbrellas which violate Article 1 of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty<sup>1</sup>.

Canada has always held the rather ambiguous – even schizophrenic - position with regard to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and NATO. For example, in 1999, Canada supported both de-alerting of nuclear weapons, and contrarily, NATO nuclear policy. Fellow Canadian, Ernie Regehr, of Project Ploughshares - who is here - pointed out recently, that Canada is no longer supporting de-alerting of nuclear weapons – and now out of step with most of the world - citing as its rationale, its now consistent position with NATO nuclear policy.

Members of the Canadian public, though, are of two minds, and maintain a divided position with regard to nuclear weapons. Last year, The Simons Foundation polled Canadians on this issue. The poll has plus or minus 2.2% accuracy. We learned that the majority of Canadians (88%) believe that nuclear weapons make the world a more dangerous place and overwhelmingly support a ban. Yet, astonishingly, more than half (53.9%) feel that Canada is safer under the protection of NATO's nuclear umbrella.

Given these statistics I do not feel I can speak for Canadians because I am not of two minds. My position is single-minded, undeviating, unwavering. I am a normal woman with children and grandchildren. I feel consistently unsafe with the 23,335 nuclear weapons in the world, and with the knowledge that thousands of these weapons are on high-alert status. So it has become my life's work to rid the world of these weapons and to eliminate their dangerous umbrellas.

For this reason, I feel most fortunate to be a Founding Partner of Global Zero, and have chosen to speak today about Preparing the Ground for Zero.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Commitment to not transfer to any recipient whatsoever nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or control over such weapons or explosive devices either directly or indirectly*

Global Zero is a new worldwide non-partisan initiative spearheaded by more than 100 International leaders working for a binding, verifiable agreement to eliminate all nuclear weapons. The groundwork for Global Zero's launch, last year in Paris, was laid by Bruce Blair, President of the World Security Institute and former nuclear launch officer. Global Zero grows from the premise that proliferation and nuclear terrorism have become the predominant threats, and that global zero is the only effective lasting solution. The joint commitment from Presidents Obama and Medvedev to eliminate nuclear weapons creates a real opportunity to achieve this.

The dramatic rise of Global Zero and world-wide outpouring of support for its platform from the grass-roots to the highest levels has caught the attention of the world in a way that we long-serving nuclear disarmers just dream about.

Global Zero has the backing of many former world leaders who have not yet signed on, and I believe, some current leaders. The principal signatories of Global Zero include nine former heads of state; eight former foreign ministers from the United States, Russia, Britain and India; three former defense ministers from the United States and Britain; six former national security advisors from the United States, India and Pakistan; and nineteen former top military commanders from the United States, Russia, China, Britain, India and Pakistan.

These people have been involved at the highest levels in making political and/or practical decisions on the use, upgrading, development, and stewardship of nuclear weapons. So these are people who are being taken very seriously. Quite a few Global Zero principals are participating in this conference: The Hon. Ruud Lubbers, Sir Malcolm Rifkind, Sir Hugh Beach, the Hon. Amr Moussa, Lt. General Talat Masood, Gen. Pan Zhenqiang, Ambassador G. Parthasarathy, General Pan Zhenqiang, and our Pugwash President, Jayantha Dhanapala. I imagine there are others here that I do not know about. There are many here too, who have signed on, and I invite all conference participants to add their signatures at [www.globalzero.org](http://www.globalzero.org).

Within the coming weeks Global Zero will announce the formation of an international commission of prominent political and military leaders and policy experts from the United States, Russia, most of the other nuclear weapons states and some key non-weapons states. The Commission members will develop a detailed step-by-step action plan for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons within a date that has yet to be decided. The elimination to zero will be accomplished through phased and verified reductions over a period of years.

Last month, prior to the meetings between the Presidents of the United States and Russia, Global Zero principals, Senator Chuck Hagel and Ambassador Richard Burt, met with President Medvedev in Moscow, and with President Obama in Washington and presented them with letters signed by some eighty Global Zero members urging them to seize this opportunity by delivering a joint statement announcing that:

- 1) The United States and the Russian Federation, beginning immediately with the negotiations of a follow-on agreement to START, will work to achieve an accord for deep reductions in the two nations' arsenals and, very importantly,

- 2) That this accord will be the first step in a longer-term effort to eliminate all nuclear weapons worldwide through phased and verified reductions.

*Without doubt*, these letters; the high-level one-to one meetings; the ongoing outreach; and the exposure Global Zero has received in the media worldwide on a consistent basis, since its Inaugural Meeting in Paris, last December; have played a part in the results we are seeing. *And indeed*, both requests in the Global Zero letters are in accord with the Agreement by the two Presidents and with President Obama's Prague commitment.

The time is right now to eliminate nuclear weapons and we must not let this opportunity pass. The dramatic change in United States leadership – a President, who has committed to the United States to leading the world in abolishing its nuclear weapons - is providing the major impetus upon which the world is hanging its hopes. And the joint commitment of President Obama and Russian President Medvedev to elimination of nuclear weapons makes it a realizable goal.

As Michael Krepon of Stimson Center says, “It is remarkable how unremarkable [the] calls for eliminating nuclear weapons have become.”<sup>2</sup> However, while calls for elimination, and commitments without an end date, are not elimination, they do represent a changing dynamic.

To rid the world of nuclear weapons is no simple task. The United States and Russia are highly militarized, democratic countries - consumer societies, with strong vested interests vying to maintain their supremacy, and their wealth.

Moreover, not everyone is of view that nuclear weapons are abhorrent and that to use them would be to commit a crime against humanity. The rationale often heard in the United States - that one nuclear weapon (from Iran, North Korea or terrorists) is a threat to the country, and to eliminate nuclear weapons will make the United States the globally predominant military state - gives one no sense of security.

Russian Prime Minister Putin, in a recorded discussion with Global Zero Principal United States Ambassador Robert Blackwill, acknowledged that the world is “constantly in apprehension of some nuclear disaster” and said that he believes it is “quite possible to liberate humanity from nuclear weapons” because, he says, there are “technological developments in conventional weapons which make nuclear weapons in certain instances obsolete. “Why,” he asks, would we need nuclear weapons if we have other means?”<sup>3</sup>

This rationale is equally frightening. We do not have to accept these as valid reasons for their elimination. Indeed, we do have to acknowledge these and work against them.

In preparing the ground for zero nuclear weapons, - paving the way for zero - there are many preliminary measures – or better said – parallel concurrent steps to be taken in order to facilitate this step-by-step process so that Russia and the US can sit at a table together with the confidence that they are truly partners working together for a better, more stable world; and moreover, convinced that it is in the interests of both parties to eliminate their nuclear arsenals.

---

<sup>2</sup> “Getting to Zero” [www.dailytimes.com.pk](http://www.dailytimes.com.pk)

<sup>3</sup> *discussion with US Amb. Bob Blackwill, Matt Brown letter 15/10/08*

I am proposing two major steps. Without doubt there are others. And then I will say a few words about Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Measures. I must say at this point that nothing that I am proposing should, in any way, be placed as an obstacle in the path of nuclear disarmament.

The two steps are:

- 1) Joining together in cooperative security arrangements.
- 2) Confidence Building Measures

***Cooperative security is the new paradigm: a paradigm shift from the divisive Cold-War model***

*NATO*

President Obama and President Medvedev, in their April 1<sup>st</sup> Joint Statement, agreed that their countries would work together on issues that were destabilizing the world and agreed that the resumption of activities of the NATO-Russia Council was a positive step. However, the NATO encirclement of Russia and the positioning of military bases close to the border remains a contentious issue - an issue Mikhail Gorbachev spoke to on April 2<sup>nd</sup>, accusing the United States of failing to fulfill its promise after the reunification of Germany, that “NATO would not move a centimeter to the east.”<sup>4</sup>

It is impossible, at this stage, to back-track on this enlargement, but in order to ameliorate this situation the military bases could be removed and then, to resolve it, an invitation extended to Russia to join NATO. To invite Russia to join NATO would be consistent with the requests and proposals from the Presidents of Russia.

In 1991 President Yeltsin asked to join NATO, a request that was quickly withdrawn by his government. However, during the NATO enlargement in the 1990s, Russia was asking that the OSCE-type<sup>5</sup> - Vancouver to Vladivostok - umbrella supported by NATO and Russia over Europe and Eurasia, be the guarantor of security.

President Medvedev, in June 2008, made a similar proposal for a NATO-Russian partnership - a new European security architecture, within the framework of OSCE, the Russia-NATO Council and other organizations - to deal with current regional issues such as Iran, and Israel and Palestine in the Middle East; Pakistan and Afghanistan; North Korea and others as they emerge, for example, currently building Russia-Canada tensions over the resource-rich melting Arctic Circle.

*Missile Defense*

The Ballistic Missile Defense bases in the Czech Republic and Poland are also a contentious issue. In June 2007, President Putin proposed, as an alternative, that Russia join with the United

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://en.rian.ru/russia/20090402/120879153.html>

<sup>5</sup> OSCE: *Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe*

States to operate a Missile Defense shield in Azerbaijan. He also proposed that this Missile Defense cooperation be expanded to include NATO and the rest of Europe.

President Obama in his Prague speech made no clear commitment to a Missile Defense System. He appeared to be using this opportunity to send a message to Iran that “as long as threat from Iran persists, [the United States] will go forward with a missile defense system that is cost-effective and proven” - which of course, to date, it is not – and he committed to dismantling the system “if the Iranian threat is eliminated.”

However, if Iran continues to be a threat and the Missile Defense System is proven to work and is cost-effective, a viable plan for co-operative security would be to accept the offer from Russia to host the system in Azerbaijan.

These steps would go a long way to addressing the issues that divide Russia and the United States and prepare the ground for the task of dismantling arsenals until the number of nuclear weapons is at zero.

### ***Confidence Building Measures***

#### *NATO Nuclear Weapons*

A major confidence-building endeavour, in building the Russia-US partnership, would be for the US to remove its nuclear weapons from NATO countries. A second measure would be for the United Kingdom to remove its nuclear weapons from NATO military command. The two countries then would be complying with Article I of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

#### *And then we have Space Security*

Another confidence building measure would be for the United States to reverse its position on the need for a Treaty to Prevent an Arms Race in Space. The United States rejected the draft treaty introduced into the United Nations General Assembly by Russia and China, stating that it is unnecessary because there are no weapons in space. However, in 2001 the United States Space Agency Director announced that all NASA missions in the future would have both military and civilian applications. This position is consistent with the United States long-standing plans to dominate space, to deny access to others in order to protect its space assets.

The draft treaty presented by Russia and China, as it currently stands – (with due respect to you, Ambassador Hu. I know you have worked tirelessly to achieve this Treaty) - is not complete in that it requires clauses to prevent research, development and manufacture of space weapons, and also essential verification and transparency measures.

### ***I want now to say a few words about Non-Proliferation Measures to Prevent Armament and Re-Armament***

Presidents Obama and Medvedev, in their joint Statement, along with their Agreement to cut their arsenals, named a number of important measures - to strengthen the NPT and to fulfill the

disarmament obligations under Article VI . Two of the Article VI 13 Steps - Step 1, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and Step 3, the Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty, and the others named by the two Presidents (UN Security Council Resolution 1540, PSI etc.),<sup>6</sup> are important non-proliferation measures - prevention - and should be pursued concurrently with disarmament action. ***They are not disarmament measures and should not be considered as such. They are not elimination of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems to zero.*** □

### ***Disarmament***

Both Presidents have committed their countries to reducing their arsenals, to replacing the START Agreement due to expire at the end of the year with a new legally binding treaty. President Obama went one step further in his Prague speech saying that he and President Medvedev will seek a new agreement that is legally binding and sufficiently bold, setting the stage for further cuts and seeking to include all nuclear weapons states in this endeavour.

My hope is that the new Agreement replacing START would commit to cuts to 1000 each, with the stage set for cuts for 350 -500 weapons each. This would cover the phrase sufficiently bold – that is to say, bold enough and sufficient to interest the other nuclear weapon states.

Moreover, these cuts should include the destruction of the delivery systems, and work begin on a new multilateral treaty to ban nuclear and conventional intercontinental ballistic missiles along the lines of the bi-lateral Intermediate Range [500-5500 miles] Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF) Treaty, building on this treaty and on the groundwork laid by the International Code of Conduct Against Ballistic Missile Proliferation (ICOC).

My understanding is that the Moscow Treaty SORT will be replaced by a legally binding treaty which will be signed before the existing START I expires. The cuts will be below the requirement of the Moscow Treaty. However, the larger number not deployed, and stored, are not included in these cuts, which is disappointing and not consistent with the goal for a world free of nuclear weapons.

It is my hope that the people of the world get behind Presidents Medvedev and Obama because they cannot succeed without this support. For one thing, the members of Congress who, in the past, would not vote to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, are still in Congress, and, I have heard, have not changed their minds.

Despite the fact that in Prague, President Obama stated “clearly and with conviction America’s commitment to seek the peace and security of the a world without nuclear weapons,” there are many people, engaged at the highest levels, both within and outside government, who support the ***vision*** of a nuclear free world but their ***key word is vision***. They support reductions – even deep cuts - but they also support the retention of a low number of nuclear weapons.

The phrase ***nuclear reduction*** is currently becoming the acceptable conventional terminology for the elimination process. Nuclear reduction is the ***method*** used to reach the goal. A better,

---

<sup>6</sup> UN Security Council Resolution 1540, the Nuclear Security Initiative, The Proliferation Security Initiative, support for the IAEA

more precise term, would be *nuclear elimination - both method and goal*, and consistent with the language of President Medvedev's and President Obama's Agreement which was for a world free of nuclear weapons - nuclear disarmament, Global Zero.

Finally, I wish President Obama a very long life. And despite what his Prague speechwriters say, elimination to zero can be achieved within his lifetime, in fact this can happen while he is still a relatively young man.

Thank you very much.

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

*April 17<sup>th</sup>, 2009*