

*The Imperative of,  
and Funding Campaigns for,  
Nuclear Disarmament*

**Celebrating Peace Philanthropy and Furthering Peace  
Education in the Footsteps of Andrew Carnegie**

**The Hague Peace Palace  
2-3 September, 2013**

*Jennifer Allen Simons, C.M., Ph.D., L.L.D*  
*President,*  
*The Simons Foundation*  
*September 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2013*

I would like to thank you for the invitation to speak. And it is an honour and pleasure to be in the paramount dwelling place of the highest aspirations of humanity - the Courts of Peace and Justice for all. And, as well, to participate in the celebration of Great Philanthropy. Andrew Carnegie is a beacon for us all and I wish that our financial circumstances equaled his so that we too would have his ability to fund so extensively for the common good.

It is a pleasure to share this panel with my colleagues, Colin Archer and Tadatoshi Akiba, one of The Simons Foundation Peace Leaders; and to speak on *the Imperative of nuclear disarmament, and also on the imperative of funding campaigns for nuclear disarmament.*

It is incredible in this age of instant and excess information that the world is still held hostage, and under the threat of extinction from nuclear catastrophe; that the world's people remain at the mercy of seven democratic states, whose parliaments and Congresses are elected by the will of the people. If one resided in North Korea, or even China, it would perhaps be understandable that we would not expect to have any say in the excessive militarization of our society; and the fact that our weaponry puts at risk the lives of all the people on the planet. It is inconceivable that citizens of democracies have been essentially powerless to effect the necessary reversal of this potential catastrophe. And one must question why this is so!

Though I certainly see no mitigating circumstances for *any development and retention of nuclear weapons*, during the Cold War it was believed that there was some justification for possession of nuclear arsenals large enough to defend the state. However, there was absolutely no rationale for the build-up - the overkill - of the nuclear arsenals in the 1980s. And at this time, massive global anti-nuclear protest movements effected some change and the weapons numbers began to come down. It is distressing that, since then, we have been unable to replicate this massive outrage, to regain the disarmament movement momentum of the 1980s.

When the Cold War ended, public concern about nuclear war and nuclear weapons and the dangers these weapons pose, died away. Some thought that the weapons had been eliminated. Others just forgot about them. But for some like me, nuclear weapons continued to be an issue of major concern because *detonation of a nuclear device* is still considered the greatest threat we face. It is my fear that *such a detonation* will be the *sole catalyst* for the rapid elimination of all nuclear weapons and their ban.

The dangers posed by the existence of the weapons remain, and are, in fact, *heightened* because they are more complex.

Since the end of the Cold War, the number of nuclear weapons states has grown to nine. Nuclear weapons numbers *have* come down to some 17,000; yet with the destructive capacity of approximately four hundred thousand Hiroshima bombs – are enough *still* to kill all people on earth.

*Nuclear capable* states now number some 32; nuclear technology is proliferating and is also trafficked illegally; and terrorists continue to seek acquisition to nuclear materials and nuclear weapons.

Despite their Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty commitments to eliminate their arsenals, member nuclear weapons states – the United States, United Kingdom, France, Russia and China - the so-called P-5 - are upgrading their arsenals, creating new capabilities for their nuclear weapons,<sup>1</sup> and planning and budgeting for years ahead to continue to modernize their programmes for nuclear weapons, their delivery systems and the infrastructure required for their maintenance. The numbers may have come down but the *projected power of upgrades* may make the actual numbers of weapons less relevant.<sup>2</sup>

Non-NPT members, Pakistan and India continue to develop, upgrade and enlarge their arsenals and the delivery vehicles. Israel maintains its opacity with regard to its weapons and programmes, but the presence of nuclear weapons in the Middle East creates an incentive for further proliferation in the region.

When nuclear dangers *are* publicly addressed as an issue of concern, the focus is on North Korea, the possessor of a few weapons; on Iran which may or may not be enriching to weapons-grade material. And sometimes concern is expressed that nuclear weapon states India and Pakistan may engage in nuclear war. Little attention is paid, in the media or public discussion, to the arsenals of the P-5.

Yet, the nuclear weapons states are like sleeping dragons. They continue as though there is no commitment on their parts to eliminate these genocidal weapons which remain poised, at ready, to launch an attack.

Though the relations between the United States and Russia remain relatively friendly, and there is no danger of a deliberate nuclear exchange - nuclear war - between them, the two countries maintain their Cold War nuclear war plan, and the nuclear forces are targeted and poised - on alert - for immediate launch.

This creates the risk of deliberate or accidental use of nuclear weapons which is considered to be one of the greatest dangers we face. Their continued existence on hair-trigger alert and targeted for immediate launch creates the possibility of an accidental, a mistaken or malicious launch; and is an invitation to cyber terrorists.

We have entered a new age of Cyber Warfare with the danger *of cyber attacks* and the danger of *cyber failure*. We are seeing a growing community of Internet hackers comprising of both individuals and states. And hackers - on a daily basis - attempt to penetrate the Pentagon and the nuclear weapons command and control systems.

---

<sup>1</sup> eg US Adding new tail fin for B-61 tactical nuclear weapons

<sup>2</sup> US:ew tail fin turn from free-fall bombs to guided weapons delivered by F35 stealth fighter-bomber.  
Russia: Topol M missiles previously equipped with single warheads upgraded to MIRVed missiles

The United States nuclear command and control system is highly automated. Though the Pentagon announced that its systems are impenetrable - that it is adequately protected from an unauthorized launch - there are experts like Dr. Bruce Blair who do not agree. More frighteningly still, the Pentagon has doubts about the security - the impenetrability - of the Russian and Chinese command and control systems. There is concern that terrorist hackers could fake an attack “thus provoking a nuclear response,”<sup>3</sup> - send false signals which would cause the United States or Russia to believe they are under attack and unleash their weapons to cause – what would be – an accidental, yet catastrophic nuclear war. In my view this is the most dangerous of current nuclear threats.

There is a considerable history, as well, of nuclear accidents. And inadequate security of fissile materials and warheads, in some states, leaves open the possibility of acquisition by terrorists. And as we know, there *are* on-going attempts by terrorist organizations to acquire nuclear weapons and nuclear technology.

The possibility of a nuclear catastrophe is always before us and we are fortunate - and it is perhaps miraculous - that we have survived until now.

There is no outright ban on possession or use of weapons. Chemical and biological weapons – the other designated weapons of mass destruction – are banned but not nuclear weapons. There *are* three treaties banning nuclear weapons in specific places and interestingly, they are places where there are no humans.

Article V of the Antarctic Treaty forbids nuclear explosions or disposal of radioactive waste in the Antarctic. (The penguins are protected!). Article I of the Seabed Treaty prohibits the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the seabed and the ocean floor. However, there is no ban on submarines loaded with nuclear weapons. Article IV of the Outer Space Treaty prohibits nuclear weapons on the moon and other celestial bodies. (Extra-terrestrial beings are protected!)

There is some progress in the establishment of nuclear weapons free zones, and there are now six. However, these are not replacements for the practical task of eliminating nuclear weapons. And it will take superhuman efforts to establish nuclear weapons free zones in North America, the Arctic, or Europe, home to four nuclear weapons states.

Though we are – to a significant measure – protected from nuclear catastrophe by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty – the NPT - our security continues to be jeopardized by the P-5 who resist, *and stall* in fulfilling their Article VI commitments. In their justifications, the P-5 cite self-defence and make reference to the ICJ Opinion, Section E in which the Court cannot conclude that the *"threat or use of nuclear weapons would be lawful or unlawful in an extreme circumstance of self defence, in which the very survival of a State would be at stake."*

---

<sup>3</sup> Jason Fritz, Hacking Nuclear Command and Control.”  
cnnd.org/Documents/**Jason\_Fritz\_Hacking**\_NC2.doc

The P-5 also affirm that as long as nuclear weapons exist - which is entirely at their determination - they will be nuclear-weapon states. The mutually dependent conditions allow for no way out - no resolution (Catch 22 situation).<sup>4</sup>

The five nuclear weapons states declined to participate in a conference on the catastrophic humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons, hosted by the Government of Norway, and attended by 127 states, last March. Yet concerns about the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapon use were part of the outcome document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference and a legitimate focus in fulfilling the goals of the NPT.

And last April in Geneva, at the NPT 2015 Prepcom, a joint statement of deep concern about the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons, presented by the delegate from South Africa on behalf of eighty member states - 75% of the states participating in this Prepcom - was rejected by the five nuclear weapons states and some of the states under the US nuclear umbrella. Astonishingly, Japan - whose citizens continue to suffer from the U.S. bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki - refused to sign.<sup>5</sup>

As well, at the United Nations General Assembly in October of last year, four of five nuclear weapons states (China abstained) were the only states to vote *against* Resolution 67/56, *Taking Forward Multilateral Nuclear Disarmament Negotiations*. The purpose of this Resolution was to form an Open-ended Working Group to "develop proposals to take forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations for the achievement and maintenance of a world without nuclear weapons." The rationale being that the Conference on Disarmament has been unable to agree on a programme of work since it was established fifteen years ago. The Resolution was adopted by the General Assembly with 134 Yes votes, 34 Abstentions, and the 4 No votes from nuclear weapon states, the U.S., U.K. France, Russia. The Open-ended Working has just concluded its third meeting without participation of these states.

The above actions call into question the nuclear weapons states commitment to eliminate their arsenals.

*The very existence of nuclear weapons* poses great danger to humans. Yet nuclear weapons are an *accepted weapon* – and in fact considered by many – the military, politicians and many members of the public – *an essential weapon* – in military arsenals. There are many in civil society who do not question this because they do not understand the nature of these weapons and their catastrophic consequences.

I spoke to 350 students at a model UN a few months ago. Among other information, I compared the payload of the bomb dropped on Hiroshima with the payload of the modern

---

<sup>4</sup> The 2010 United States Nuclear Posture Review reads that *as long as nuclear weapons exist, The United States will sustain safe, secure, and effective nuclear forces*. And NATO policy reads *as long as there are nuclear weapons in the world, NATO will remain a nuclear Alliance*.

<sup>5</sup> because the documents “stated that nuclear weapons should not be used under any circumstances. Ray Acheson, *A strategy for nuclear disarmament*, [www.reachingcriticalwill.org/disarmament-for a/npt/2013](http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/disarmament-for-a/npt/2013)

bomb. At the end of my talk a high school student came to me and said there are other weapons just as dangerous. I asked what they were and he said “Drones.” When I told him that one nuclear weapon could kill a couple of million people within 10 seconds he looked absolutely shocked. I realized that references to Hiroshima and comparisons to the Hiroshima bomb do not resonate with young people.

I imagine Hiroshima Day is viewed like Memorial Day or Armistice Day - a day for remembering the war dead with no reflection on the fact that on that day, *one* air-exploded bomb above Hiroshima *killed 150,000 in 9 seconds* and a second over Nagasaki *killed 200,000 in the same time frame* and furthermore, maimed, and destroyed the health - for a lifetime and beyond - of an equal number of survivors.

There is lack of knowledge in the general public - at all levels of society - about nuclear weapons and about nuclear forces. Bruce Blair, former nuclear launch officer and Co-Founder of Global Zero said he believes that even the US President is not fully briefed on the extent of the US nuclear war machine.

Ignorance on the part of the mass public of nuclear weapons is in itself a great danger; ignorance of their existence, their payload, and their supreme difference from weapons of war. As former Chicago professor, Hans Morgenthau, said a nuclear device is not a weapon but rather is "an instrument of unlimited, universal destruction"; and nuclear war is not war, but rather "suicide and genocide.... a self-defeating absurdity".<sup>6</sup>

The task is to educate the public on the nature of these horrifying instruments of mass death in order to seek their active support for their elimination. And it is quite a challenge to find the right words, to find the right images which will resonate in the public realm!

Campaigns are important because they *do* raise the issue and promote discussion. A good campaign, like Global Zero's and ICAN, has as its foundation a strong in-depth education/information component. And campaigns have been effective in the past. For example, the St. Louis Baby Tooth Survey: the discovery of levels of strontium 90 in baby teeth rising in parallel with atmospheric nuclear testing and the consequent women's protests - the 1961 Women's March - influenced President Kennedy to call for a ban on atmospheric testing.

In the 1980s, campaigns resulted in one million marching in New York. And in Europe, five million Europeans demonstrated against the planned deployment of US Intermediate range nuclear missiles on their territory. The Europeans were not successful. However, it stunned President Reagan who decided he must propose nuclear disarmament. Civil society, constituencies hold the key to progress on these issues.

---

<sup>6</sup> Hans J. Morgenthau, "The Fallacy of Thinking Conventionally About Nuclear Weapons", *Arms Control and Technological Innovation*, ed. David Carlton & Carlo Schaerf, 1977, 2pp. 255

Attempts are being made to regenerate the groundswell of public protest without much success to date. Social media campaigns on Facebook, Twitter and Avaaz have not resulted in bringing the people to the streets. However, there has been success in reaching other areas of potential influence.

In 2005, The Mayors for Peace, under the leadership of Mayor Akiba, launched its 2020 Campaign calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons by 2020. The Mayors for Peace, thanks to the work of Mr. Akiba, radically expanded its network from 408 member cities to 4680 and now comprises of over 5500 cities standing together for nuclear abolition and world peace.

In 2007, the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War launched the ICAN Campaign, actively educating the public on the dangers to human health, human life and the environment. They have been successful in bringing this issue to the attention of the UN; and convened a conference parallel with the UN in Oslo on the Humanitarian Consequences of Nuclear Weapons; and are a strong presence in the newly-formed UN Open-Ended Working Group.

Global Zero, which has received extraordinary global media coverage, was launched in Paris in 2008; and has a step-by-step Action Plan for the phased, verifiable, multilateral elimination of all nuclear weapons by 2030, accompanied by a legally binding agreement which would be negotiated in Phase III of the plan - 2019-2023.

Its membership comprises over three hundred eminent world leaders and more than 400,000 signatories worldwide, more than 150 university campus chapters in fifteen countries, ongoing student training institutes, and a documentary film, Countdown to Zero. The Global Zero research papers, the Global Zero Action Plan, and the Commission Reports have been influential at the highest levels of government.

With President Obama in the White House the time is ripe for further campaigning for nuclear disarmament. President Obama is the first President to commit to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. But leadership in democratic states comes not from the top, but rather, in response to the citizens, the voters, the grassroots. So while President Obama can make this commitment to a nuclear weapon-free world, he needs the public behind him in order to carry it through.

With politically difficult issues - like nuclear disarmament - the only possible hope for resolution of the issue is an aroused public - building public support to increase the leverage of politicians who – with their eyes on the next election – could provide positive support for nuclear cuts.

This requires significant funding. We need the largesse of philanthropists like Andrew Carnegie; because nuclear disarmament educators and campaigners are competing against the defense industry, which not only lobbies in the capital cities of the nuclear weapon states, but as well, in the United States - and perhaps other countries – provides funding for election campaigns for members of Congress and state governors.

It is distressing to me that disarmament education and campaigns are so seriously underfunded; that nuclear disarmament campaigners are labeled naïve; that campaigns are not funded by most foundations because they are considered “advocacy” and political, and “special interest” rather than “education” and “in the interests of humanity”.

Also foundations tend to move with the political times. The few large U.S. foundations discontinued funding in this area beginning during the Clinton presidency when the Rockefeller Brothers and Merck Foundation bowed out; and during the Bush presidency, McArthur and Ford discontinued support in this area; and I am not sure where Carnegie stands. Unfortunately, because of the death of W. Alton Jones and lack of interest in this issue on the part of his heirs, we lost a major contributor to the education and campaign aspects of nuclear disarmament.

I am a Founding Partner of Global Zero; and The Simons Foundation is the Principal Sponsor. We are a small, private foundation and are “out on a limb” in funding this organization. Global Zero has also received significant financial support from the Skoll Urgent Threats Foundation, and grants from Ploughshares Fund; and we were happy, recently, to receive a generous grant from Steve Killelea’s foundation.

We are restricted in our activities because of a dearth of funding, as is ICAN and Mayors for Peace. The time is right for the final push for the elimination of these catastrophic weapons. It is my hope that the large foundations, the Rockefellers Brothers Fund, the Merck, Ford and McArthur foundations will return to funding education and advocacy for nuclear disarmament. And recognize that it falls under the rubrics of “education” and “in the interests of humanity.”

The possession of nuclear weapons carries with it such great risk and endangers humanity. And the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against their use, or threat of use.

Thank you very much!

September 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2013