

*Opening Remarks*

**The Simons Foundation  
and Global Affairs Canada**

**GRADUATE RESEARCH AWARDS  
SEMINAR**

Lester B. Pearson Building  
Ottawa, Canada

March 1, 2018

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

Good Morning,

It is a pleasure to be here, participating again, in the annual Graduate Research Awards seminar, a programme in which the Department of Global Affairs and The Simons Foundation have partnered for fifteen years.

I would like to thank Nancy Clark, and Chris Conway who has moved on, of the Department of Global Affairs, and Elaine Hynes, from The Simons Foundation, for their excellent organization and management of this disarmament education programme.

Disarmament education is a neglected subject. There are few initiatives in schools and universities dedicated to research and education on the negative effects of weapons - from handguns to nuclear weapons to 21<sup>st</sup> century weaponry - essential education to counter the arms trade and so-called military industrial complex - the most lucrative of all businesses - and the enemies of disarmament.

To the Awardees – Shahryar, Reid, Rachel and Gregor - I congratulate you and commend you for your choice of study - for your specialization in current critical disarmament and non-proliferation issues, in space security and in the interesting possibility that a feminist approach may change the dynamics. I have been told by women, who aspire and achieve positions traditionally held by men, that they do not have to become men but it is necessary to harden their attitudes and themselves, which is discouraging. We women do not aspire to be the Amazons of Greek legend, but rather to be peacemakers, peace-builders.

I hope that you will continue to focus on these issues, and pursue careers in *academia*, the foreign service, politics or the NGO world in civil society.

Of most concern to me is the danger of nuclear war - deliberate or inadvertent - and I am increasingly worried that the Syria war with its multiple backers - Russia, the United States, Iran, Israel, Turkey - will become a global conflict and involve nuclear weapons.

Last week, I returned from the Munich Security Conference. Bruce Blair was also there. We witnessed a radical departure from the usual dialogue, discussions and exchange of views – heralding, perhaps, the demise of diplomacy and dialogue and in some instances democracy – a growing trend to authoritarian leadership.

In the place of almost three days of dialogue and discussion on the podium, we were subjected - for the most part - to a succession of solo statements from leaders airing their grievances, attacking, blaming and insulting each other, and rationalizing their own positions.

The United States, for example, extolled the virtue of its transparency compared to Russia's; rationalized its war-oriented Nuclear Posture Review as necessary to combat Russia's new nuclear weapons, ignored its legal obligations under the NPT, and heralding - in essence - a new nuclear arms race.

Russia denounced the US Nuclear Posture Review as leaving Russia no "option but to do the same", listed a host of grievances about the US-led expansion of NATO, and accused Europe of returning to the Nazi era. Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu waved an alleged piece of a drone at the Foreign Minister of Iran who said it was ludicrous and not worthy of response, and so on.

This war of words is indicative of how far the international realm has fallen from diplomacy, dialogue and the post-Cold War ideals of peace and global co-operation. Relations between Russia and the United States, between NATO and Russia, are at crisis point. North Korea is rapidly escalating its nuclear programme and it seems that the United States wants to engage both North Korea and Iran in war.

India and Pakistan tensions are at a critical high because of shots exchanged at the border - breaking the ceasefire. China and India are sparring with India testing a ballistic missile. All nuclear weapons states are upgrading their weapons and the United States Nuclear Posture Review presents plans to maintain, upgrade and diversify its nuclear arsenal. And we move closer to nuclear war.

It is difficult to know how to ameliorate this dangerous situation; to know how to create the conditions conducive to a return to diplomacy, dialogue and negotiations in order to reduce and eliminate the threat posed by nuclear weapons. It is difficult but not impossible.

Minister Freeland, in an address on Canada's foreign policy priorities, stated that Canada can no longer rely on the United States for global leadership and thus Canada will step up and - as she said - "set our own clear and sovereign course." She stressed Canada's robust support for the rules-based international order and all its institutions and stated that Canada will seek ways to strengthen and improve them.

Even though nuclear issues were not mentioned, it is heartening to learn that Canada has returned to the foreign policy of previous Liberal governments with its support for multilateralism and institutions, most importantly, the United Nations and NATO. It is my hope that this return includes the active nuclear disarmament agenda of the previous Liberal government.

Canada has always been a strong supporter of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and its goal of a nuclear free world. And the NPT needs support, needs to be strengthened

and Canada can play a strong role in shoring it up. Canada's emphasis has been on the step-by-step approach with a focus on the FMCT.

The US Nuclear Posture Review makes no mention of the FMCT, which further lessens the chance of achieving this Treaty. It would, perhaps, be more useful for Canada to shift its focus to other Article VI obligations, such as:

- Encouraging Russia and the US to negotiate an extension of the New Start Treaty. Russia has expressed willingness to extend the Treaty
- Initiating a conference on the Middle East Zone free of Nuclear Weapons and other Weapons of Mass Destruction
- Forcefully objecting to the nuclear weapons states' modernization of nuclear weapons and the United States's development of new battlefield nuclear weapons
- Forcefully objecting to US plan for a nuclear response to non-nuclear attacks, which include cyber attacks
- Forcefully objecting to pre-emptive use of nuclear weapons
- Forcefully objecting to the **threat of use** of nuclear weapons
- Encouraging the nuclear weapons states to respect their commitments with regard to security assurances, and to extend these assurances to non-nuclear weapons states
- Forcefully objecting to the United States rejection of its commitment, under Article VI of the NPT, to reduce the role and significance of nuclear weapons in military and security concepts, doctrines and policies

The problem with the NPT is that the nuclear weapons states refuse to fulfil the third pillar obligation of the three-way bargain – refuse to eliminate their nuclear weapons. Furthermore, the NPT is not universal and the conditions to which the three nuclear weapons states outside the Treaty would be obligated to agree are unacceptable and perhaps more applicable to the Ban Treaty.

The Nuclear Ban Treaty does not compete with the NPT. Rather it complements it. The Ban Treaty - premature though it may be - is the ultimate goal of the NPT. It is essential that the NPT be saved, be strengthened, until the time comes when all states are ready to sign and ratify this Treaty.

It is my hope that the Government of Canada will forge a more radical path to nuclear disarmament than has been the case during the past 11 years, and that Canada returns to its former role as a leading middle power in the international realm.

Thank you!

March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2018