

Mr. Jonathan Granoff, President, Global Security Institute
“Moving Forward”

Rush transcript of speech delivered at the Fifth Article VI Forum

March 30, 2008

Dublin, Ireland

The Global Security Institute has three co-programs, and they are integrated.

One of them is the Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation Disarmament, of which Alyn Ware is the driving force, together with Alexa McDonough and Uta Zapf, two Co-Presidents who are also here, along with the other Co-Presidents Marian Hobbs, Mikyung Lee, and Senator Abacca Anjain Maddisson. PNND is an integrated organization that is in over 70 countries now, with about 500 parliamentarians, and growing very rapidly. There is nothing like this really on the planet, which has focused on a core issue of this nature, and it is our hope that, as we move forward, the kind of ideas that are emerging from the consultative process of the Middle Powers Initiative will find fertile ground in parliaments all over the world. So we have now set up an infrastructure where the consensus agenda that is emerging from this consultative process can rapidly be put into play in parliaments. We believe the political winds will shift in the next 15 months, and during that time, I believe it is very important to put the kind of recommendations that you see in the Middle Powers Initiative brief into play in parliaments, in a very forceful fashion. If you are looking at the proposals in the brief of MPI, you will see that they meet criteria that has emerged from our reflections, which is that each of them has to stand on its own accord, independently, and has to enhance security, diminish no state security, enhance the rule of law, and have almost a total consensus on the planet - there are only a few states, at this point, which are holdouts. So the momentum on these proposals is very much on our side, I believe. Therefore, if there is a kind of push for the political process, I think we will be able to get some of them in the near term.

The other major program of the Global Security Institute is the Bipartisan Security Group, of which Ambassador Grey is the director in Washington, along with Thomas Graham who is Chair and there are a number of other very highly distinguished former US diplomats and experts - some are known to many of you worldwide: Rose Gottemoeller, who used to deal with the department of energy; James Goodby, who was very much involved in the Nuclear Threat Initiative; David Koplow, who was deputy chief counselor of the Defense Department... We were able to take these proposals and bring them into the US Congress in a very effective way. Bob, as you all know, is an extremely effective advocate, and we are the *Bipartisan Security Group*, so when Dr. Blix came to Washington with the Blix Commission, the first place I went to was Senator Wiener's office, and Senator Lindsey Graham's, from South Carolina: we make a real effort to go to conservative Republicans and make the case, and I think that that's unique, so the kind of proposals and issues that we discuss here, we make an effort to get to the places that would normally not be gotten to in Washington.

So much of our problem is that we are not effectively framing the issue accurately: nuclear weapons are part of a series of unique global threats that humanity faces. I think the Nobel Laureates at their last summit got it right when they said there are three issues that are inextricably correlated, because none of them can be solved by any small group of countries alone: you cannot protect the global commons, the living system upon which civilization

depends unless there is a global regime to do so. If one country can dump in the ocean, everyone can dump through their flack, so you have to have a global regime to protect the oceans. And if the ph of the oceans is sufficiently disturbed, civilization will be dramatically effected. 70% of the fishing stocks are over fished, so we are all dependent on the health of the oceans, as we are all dependent on the climate. There is a great genius in going from what we call biodiversity, which is protecting some other species, and making the equation to the climate, which everybody – every single person – recognizes as personal. And once they made it personal, they framed it in a way that was effective politically: you have to address the climate globally, but you are personally concerned – and that to me is the tipping point, when somebody figured out how to do that. The rain forest, we all depend on the lungs of the planet- these three issues cannot be dealt with by any small group of nations.

The second rather is poverty. The way we are dealing with development now is multi and bilateral arrangements, and the Millennium Development Goals will not be met until there is a norm that every country in the world is committed to in eliminating poverty.

And the third, of course, is nuclear disarmament. The Nobel Peace Laureates at their last summit - where I had the privilege of representing the International Peace Bureau, one of the organizations of the Middle Powers Initiative, came up with three questions that every political leader should be asked, seeing these three as integrated. Now, the Nobel Peace Laureates as a group are people with an extraordinary political experience in success of doing things that will break through effort. They have made dramatic change, and so I think that their informing us of a way of framing the issues, of a way of speaking to the public, is very relevant. We have not been able to do that, and I think Ambassador Asmady is mark on when she says that we have to find a way of integrating nuclear disarmament in the full range of issues of concern of the United Nations, and the full range of concerns that people feel as personal; and in order to do that we have to upgrade the political prominence of the issue. So, I think that one thing that we could come out of this event with, in the Middle Powers Initiative and in the Global Security Institute, is committing to creating a United Nations day devoted to nuclear disarmament, in which we would have celebrations, in which we would bring youth, in which we can bring Nobel Peace Laureates, in which we can bring celebrities, and in which we can give the issue a higher level of public prominence, and I suggest that it be called “The United Nations Nuclear Disarmament Freedom Day”. “Disarmament” is a very, very difficult word; “Freedom” is a very good word - and so, the focus would be public outreach, and it would be our inning to speak, in which the moral imperative, the political imperative, the legal imperative, the security imperative of nuclear disarmament would be the focus of that day. If we had that kind of a platform, we could make the case that this is an environmental issue, that this is an issue of personal security to everybody, and we could get the microphone, and that would be very valuable, it would be inexpensive to do, and would be very easy to do. My suggestion is that it would be done not during the very high traffic of autumn, but it would be done when the college students are out in June, and New York is filled with young people, so you could have associated celebrations in the metropolitan area, which is a major, very important media market. And I know, as you can see, the other document that I passed around is the Nobel Peace Laureates declaration, called the Rome declaration, where the Nobel Peace Laureates came out with their very strong statements on nuclear abolition, and I feel confident that we would be able to get a critical mass of Nobel Peace Laureates – Michael

Douglas is the United Nations' messenger to Peace for Disarmament – so, if this were proposed at the next General Assembly (through the First Committee), this would be doable by June 2009, which would be a very opportune time to highlight the consensus agenda, and get our message out to a larger public.

The other issue that I want to highlight in our framing is to not allow the missile defense argument to continue. Dr. Coyle, yesterday, in our session, confirmed that this is a first step toward offensive space weaponization. Now, whether offensive space weaponization works or does not work is not what is relevant. What is relevant is that it expresses an aspiration of an exclusivist policy, of a pursuit of unilateral hegemony, completely opposite and offensive to cooperative security based on the rule of law and norms, that is the underline premise of both the NPT and the United Nations' system. The idea that one country would pursue full spectrum dominance, in derogation of the security interest of all others, should be aberrant to every country in the world, and as an American I want to say it is completely aberrant to the principles upon which America is based, which is participation and democracy, and that *all* are equal under the eyes of the law. And if we are going to have a cooperative regime to protect the climate, we have to have a cooperative security regime - because I do not believe that in the long term the level of cooperation needed to protect the climate will take place in a multi-tiered security world in which the security interest of some are privileged, dynamically privileged in derogation of the security of others. I do not think the level of cooperation needed will be forthcoming, and we have seen in the last few years in the UN system, as Ambassador Butler pointed out, an atmosphere of negativity, of cynicism, because of this sort of shredding of the spirit of cooperation. The counter-proliferation war in Iraq – it's the first counter-proliferation war- was based on this model, that's the underlying philosophical model behind it, that threats of another counter-proliferation conflict with Iran...if we allow it to go forward, I say it'll be equally catastrophic, because these kinds of efforts shred the level of cooperation needed to address these very real threats that we all have.

The Hoover Institute initiative, which has gotten a lot of attention here, is a wonderful thing because it has forever put to rest the notion that to be for the abolition of nuclear weapons is impractical or un-American. By virtue of having such distinguished Americans come out in principle for the abolition of nuclear weapons, no one can say to you, as diplomats, again, "If you are for the abolition of nuclear weapons, you're anti-American." That is gone. That is a change, it is a huge change. Moreover, they can't say "This is utopian or impractical" because when people like Henry Kissinger and George Shultz, William Perry, and Sam Nunn and that whole other group that signed on come out for the premises that there is a practical root, that puts that argument to rest. But what they have not done is what we are doing here: they have not reaffirmed the centrality of the existing institutional structures that need our focus. There is nothing intrinsically wrong with the NPT: it sets the norm of the unacceptability of nuclear weapons as one of its pillars. There is nothing intrinsically wrong with the United Nations *per se*, as a place in which the world can all come together, and there is nothing wrong with the premise that there *is* international law, and that the International Court of Justice is the highest court in the world. And if you look at the second Wall Street Journal article, it makes no mention of the NPT, no mention of international law, no mention of customary international law, no mention of the United Nations' system and working within it. And I

think it is absolutely essential that we stay on message in that regard, and bring that initiative into the processes because that initiative can help create political will, which I see as the gasoline that has needed to get the car moving. But if we think that a group of eminent persons on their own, outside of the institutional system, will be at all sufficient, I think we are deluding ourselves - I think that we have to call upon the political leadership *above* the Room Four, above the CD, above the First Committee, above the General Assembly - foreign ministers and heads of state to now start speaking out. Now that they have the room, do not let it slip away, now it is the time to suggest that you are seniors, you cannot be accused of being un-American and you cannot be accused of being unrealistic if you speak out now, before the door closes, before the naysayers can push to close that door. Seize the time before the NPT review, before a new President comes into the United States, because it should not look like the rest of the world is waiting for the United States to change. This is a global issue, not a United States issue. Nuclear weapons are not a United States problem, they are a global problem: every citizen is threatened, and every head of state should be speaking out on this and preparing statements as soon as they possibly can, because they can no longer have that accusation.

So, I would like to conclude with just a simple analogy, which is that it was scientists who were able to identify the crisis of climate change for the citizens of the planet, because they had a unique understanding of the dynamics of the climate - and it is a global crisis. We are in a crisis with nuclear weapons: if we cannot get this horse back in the barn, we know that the next generation of weapons of mass destruction is going to allow fewer people greater destructive capacity at a lower cost; that is what computers have done. We know that. We know that information travels faster than it is ever traveled, and knowledge cannot be contained in one country - so we have to get this back in the barn. And the people who understand the health or the sickness of the international body politic is only one class of people, who really understand it - because the international body politic is a human creation, it is a creation created by diplomats; and it is, in fact, only diplomats who really have their pulse on the health of the international body politic - the military guys don't have it, the political leaders don't have it, the academic community doesn't have it - it is uniquely in the gift of diplomats to explain that to the people. In addition, I understand that what happens in Conference Room 4 stays in Conference Room 4. I understand that culturally diplomats cannot go speak out to the public - I am not suggesting that. But diplomats uniquely can inform their superiors of the prices we face, and the consequences of not speaking out, the consequences of allowing businesses to continue as usual. They can push it up the political ladder, so I would urge that the opportunity that the Hoover Institute Initiative has provided for us be seized in the moment. I am suggesting that we have a United Nations' Day devoted to nuclear disarmament - "Nuclear Weapons Freedom Day" - and I am suggesting that we push the issue of nuclear elimination, the core principle of Article VI, up the political ladder in this moment of political opportunity.

Nuclear weapons are mysterious; the smallest particles release the biggest amount of energy, but...creation is mysterious; we do not know everything.

There was a realism that brought to an end the conflicts in Nicaragua and San Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala, realism that peace could prevail. There was a realism that ended

the cold war without a hot war, and there was a realism that ended apartheid without bloodshed.

There is a realism that can bring us to a nuclear weapons free world.