



# WORDS MUST MEAN SOMETHING

*A Report of the Conference*

**“Nuclear Disarmament: Compass Point for Progress  
and Accountability”**

*co-sponsored by the EastWest Institute, the Global Security Institute  
and the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies*

**United Nations Day,  
October 24, 2011**

**THE EASTWEST INSTITUTE**  
[www.ewi.info](http://www.ewi.info)

The EastWest Institute is a global think-and-do tank that devises innovative solutions to pressing security concerns and mobilizes networks of individuals, institutions and nations to implement these solutions.

EWI was founded in 1980 when John Edwin Mroz and Ira Wallach set out to bridge divides across the Iron Curtain. With vast networks in political, military, and business establishments in the US, Europe, and the Soviet Union, EWI quickly established a reputation as a trusted convener with the ability to maintain lines of communication across divides when official channels failed to do so.

We have continued our work in much the same spirit since 1989, but the “East” and “West” in our name no longer represent the political divisions of the Cold War. We have since expanded our work to become a global organization, working with the US, NATO, Turkey, Russia, China, India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran and many other countries in Europe and Asia.

**THE GLOBAL SECURITY INSTITUTE**  
[www.gs institute.org](http://www.gs institute.org)

The Global Security Institute is dedicated to strengthening international cooperation and security based on the rule of law, with a particular focus on nuclear arms control, non-proliferation and disarmament. GSI was founded by Senator Alan Cranston whose insight that nuclear weapons are impractical, unacceptably risky, and unworthy of civilization continues to inspire GSI’s efforts to contribute to a safer world. GSI has developed an exceptional team that includes former heads of state and government, distinguished diplomats, effective politicians, committed celebrities, religious leaders, Nobel Peace Laureates, disarmament and legal experts and concerned citizens.

**THE JAMES MARTIN CENTER FOR NONPROLIFERATION STUDIES**  
[cns.miis.edu](http://cns.miis.edu)

The James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies (CNS) strives to combat the spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) by training the next generation of nonproliferation specialists and disseminating timely information and analysis. CNS at the Monterey Institute of International Studies is the largest nongovernmental organization in the United States devoted exclusively to research and training on nonproliferation issues.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	page 4
Synopsis.....	page 5
Evening Event.....	page 12
Conclusion .....	page 12
Links.....	page 13

## ANNEXES

Conference program

Transcript of EWI President John Edwin Mroz

Transcript of EWI Chairman Francis Finlay

Transcript of GSI President Jonathan Granoff

Transcript of CNS Director Dr. William Potter

# Words Must Mean Something

## An Informal Report of the United Nations Day Conference, “Nuclear Disarmament: Compass Point for Progress and Accountability”

### Introduction

Since UN Day of October 24, 2008 when Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon launched his comprehensive Five Point Proposal on nuclear disarmament, significant progress had been made. The United States and Russia brought into force a new START treaty that will significantly reduce their deployed nuclear arsenals. 47 states committed to numerous specific actions that will strengthen nuclear security and reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism at an unprecedented Nuclear Security Summit in Washington, DC. Some states and security organizations have begun reevaluations of security doctrines with a view to de-emphasize the role of nuclear weapons. And, in 2010, the unanimously adopted Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference outlined an ambitious 64-point action plan on non-proliferation, disarmament, and peaceful use of nuclear energy with a view to the “total elimination of nuclear weapons.”

These significant strides of progress must be measured, however, against concurrent, counterproductive trends. Plans for new nuclear weapon delivery systems continue apace in both the US and Russia, while collective responses to the proliferation challenges in the Middle East, Southeast and Northeast Asia remain sporadic and ineffective. Regrettably, nearly every state with nuclear weapons is either modernizing or expanding its arsenals. Some are doing both.

The Secretary-General’s Five Point Proposal remains relevant today and can help inspire work in many different forums and levels of diplomacy and civil society. It upholds a clear goal and emphasizes the incremental steps needed to get there. Failure to achieve greater progress in fulfilling the moral and practical imperative of eliminating nuclear weapons will result in cynicism toward the most important tool the world presently has to ensure peace --- solemnly negotiated and agreed upon commitments. That is why the coherence and common purpose expressed by the Secretary General is so critical.

We are honored that our respective organizations have hosted, together, two extraordinary sessions at the United Nations on UN Day. The first was seized by the Secretary-General to roll out his Five Point Proposal, and the second convened again diplomats, activists and specialists, three years later, to assess our collective progress and identify next steps to advance nuclear disarmament and hold states accountable to their commitments.

The following report of the day’s events—which included two main plenaries at the UN, breakout sessions at the Permanent Missions of Switzerland, Germany and Kazakhstan, and an evening reception hosted by the Permanent Mission of India—will be distributed to UN missions, parliaments, foreign ministries and civil society institutions around the world. We hope that it contributes to the growing momentum leading towards the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons, the imperative of our time regarded by Secretary-General Ban as “a global public good of the highest order.”

## Synopsis

Three years after launching his Five Point Proposal for the elimination of nuclear weapons, which included support for a nuclear weapons convention, the **United Nations Secretary-General, Ban Ki-Moon**, returned to the same forum on UN Day 2011 in UN headquarters in New York to observe that states have failed in their commitments. He observed: “Here we are. Tens of thousands of nuclear weapons remain. New ones are being designed and built every day. And to what purpose?” He went on to say, “As Secretary-General, I want to bring disarmament down to earth. Instead of hearing the word ‘disarmament’ floating in the air, I want to see disarmament facts on the ground. This is what inspired my five point plan for action.”



*(L-R): EWI President John Mroz, EWI Co-Chairman Francis Finaly, Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, GSI President Jonathan Granoff and EWI's Raymond Karam.*

Three organizations collaborated to convene this review meeting— the EastWest Institute, the Global Security Institute and the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies—which was organized in partnership with the UN Office of Disarmament Affairs and the High Representative for Disarmament,

Ambassador Sergio Duarte. Diplomats, activists and specialists convened together to review progress on the third anniversary of Secretary-General's Ban's Five Point Proposal.

Five key analytical messages emerged from the conference:

1. Strategic imperatives, including the foundations of strategic nuclear stability, are changing rapidly with advances in precision conventional weapons, military uses of space and cyber weapons.
2. There is a moral imperative to eliminate nuclear weapons.
3. Some states are not honoring their obligations of good faith negotiations to eliminate nuclear weapons in a reasonable time frame.
4. Existing mechanisms for holding states accountable for progress on eliminating nuclear weapons are inadequate.
5. The political climate needed to promote sustained progress toward the elimination of nuclear weapons is weakening under pressure of other global challenges and deteriorating security relationships among some states with nuclear weapons or potential to acquire nuclear weapons.

These assessments overshadowed important progress which had been made in the three years since UN Day 2008:

- In 2009, at the behest of US President Barack Obama, the Security Council held its first ever summit at the level of heads of state to focus on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, with a resulting resolution 1887, a significant political addition to the architecture required to build a nuclear weapon-free world.
- In Washington, President Obama hosted a Nuclear Security Summit in April the next year, where 47 states committed to strengthen nuclear security and reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism at the Nuclear Security Summit.
- In December 2009, the Prime Ministers of Japan and Australia presented the Report of the International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament, “Eliminating Nuclear Threats: A Practical Agenda for Global Policymakers,” which recommended, inter alia, setting a medium term “minimization point” target of a world with less than 2,000 nuclear warheads by 2025, as well as a reconceptualization of nuclear doctrines, including deterrence and security assurances.
- In March 2010, the United States and Russia completed negotiations on the New START Treaty that will significantly reduce their nuclear arsenals. In April 2010, 47 states committed to strengthen nuclear security and reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism at the Nuclear Security Summit in Washington DC. Some states and security organizations have begun reevaluations of security doctrines with a view deemphasizing the role of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference, which was unanimously adopted, outlines an ambitious 64-point action plan on non-proliferation, disarmament, and peaceful use of nuclear energy with a view to the “total elimination of nuclear weapons.”
- There have also been numerous significant civil society initiatives to advance nuclear disarmament. For example, the Nuclear Security Project of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, Global Zero, the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN), the Middle Powers Initiative, the Nobel Peace Laureates Summit, and the United Religions Initiative are but a few.

Thus the 2011 UN Day event convened at an auspicious time, when current momentum could, with the right infusion of political will, strategic focus and agreement on practical steps, overcome the challenges that continue to manifest on the international stage.

Beyond evaluating progress made since October 2008 towards long-term goals in nuclear disarmament, the event aimed also to identify next steps for holding states accountable for their commitments to reduce their reliance on nuclear weapons.

Secretary-General Ban offered the following key suggestions:

- deeper reductions in the largest nuclear arsenals, including limits on both non-strategic and non-deployed nuclear weapons.
- Steps towards greater transparency and shared knowledge of existing stockpiles of weapons, fissile materials and delivery systems, perhaps by strengthening the UN’s disarmament repository;
- Elaborating legal obligations needed to achieve nuclear disarmament, including the contents of a future nuclear weapons convention;
- Holding another Security Council summit on the subject;
- Entry-into-force of the Protocols to all regional nuclear weapon-free zone treaties, with a



## EXCERPT OF KEYNOTE PRESENTATION BY SECRETARY-GENERAL BAN KI-MOON:

...This is again the third time I've spoken at a conference organized by the EastWest Institute. At the first, in 2008, I launched a five-point proposal for achieving a world free of nuclear weapons. And, thank you very much for your strong summit commitment and support and raising the awareness and raising the support at the international community.



*EWI Co-Chairman Francis Finaly and High Representative Sergio Duarte flank Secretary-General Ban as he delivers his keynote remarks.*

Then, as now, I believed we are at a crucial moment.

I believed the time was right to inject new momentum into the disarmament agenda; to build on the energy and ideas of so many around the world who have challenged us to act, and to act now...

...Now, we all know that the experts have been talking for decades about banning nuclear weapons.

And yet, here we are. Tens of thousands of nuclear weapons remain. New ones are being designed and built everyday. And to what purpose?

Even those who believe in this noble cause too often speak of nuclear disarmament as a distant dream, even a pie-in-the-sky idea.

As Secretary-General, I want to bring disarmament down to earth, not a pie-in-the-sky idea. Instead of hearing the word "disarmament" floating in the air, I want to see disarmament facts on the ground.

This is what inspired my five-point proposal for action....Three years on, we have seen some concrete progress...

Ladies and Gentlemen, today, I am going to outline my thoughts for how to advance this progress.

Most immediately, the world is expecting a deeper reduction in the largest nuclear arsenals. This should include limits on both non-strategic nuclear weapons and non-deployed weapons. And by weapon reduction, I mean weapon destruction.

There is an indispensable role here for international verification, especially over the disposition of fissile materials from dismantled weapons.

We need a significant improvement in transparency. Too little is known about existing stockpiles of weapons, fissile materials, and delivery systems. The UN's disarmament repository offers a useful tool for States in encouraging greater transparency.

Next year's first session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference offers an opportunity to strengthen accountability in fulfilling the disarmament commitments made at the 2010 Review Conference.

We must also strengthen the rule of law in disarmament.

This would include elaboration of the legal obligations needed to achieve nuclear disarmament, including the contents

of a future nuclear weapons convention.

I would also add the possibility of another Security Council summit meeting; and ratification of the Protocols to all the regional nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties, especially in Central Asia and Southeast Asia, along with determined efforts to establish a WMD-free zone in the Middle East.

The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty should be brought into force without further delay.

And, of course, we cannot advance rule of law issues without the Conference on Disarmament, the world's only multilateral negotiating body for disarmament. For too long, this vital body has been paralyzed by differing priorities. It is stumbling into irrelevance. This does credit to no one. It must fulfill its responsibility to act.

As we look ahead, we must keep our eyes fixed on our universally agreed "ultimate goal" of general and complete disarmament.

All of what I have proposed is achievable and none would impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence as affirmed in the Charter...

...We can and we must continue this momentum for progress.

Excellencies, Ladies and gentlemen,

Exactly one week from today, the world will welcome the seventh billionth member of our human family.

We are 7 days from 7 billion.

What kind of future will that child have?

We know that world of tomorrow is shaped by the decisions we make today.

A world free of nuclear weapons is a concrete possibility.

Let us realize that dream so that 7 billion people can live in peace and security.

Thank you very much for your commitment.



particular focus on Central and Southeast Asia, “along with determined efforts to establish a WMD-free zone in the Middle East.

To **General (ret.) T. Michael Moseley**, a former Chief of Staff of the US Air Force, “it is not so much the numbers that worry me, as the broader military strategic policies.” In General Moseley’s view, there needs to be an “effective linking mechanism” between UN disarmament processes and political processes aimed at reducing tensions within broader conflict issues. He advocated for “new mechanisms that allow us to respond better” to the “new, transformative technologies” in missiles, communications, space-based intelligence capabilities, kinetic and non-kinetic force weapon systems, cyber warfare threats and other technologies that have shaken confidence-building and arms control measures used to manage nuclear weapons confrontations. Specifically, he called for greater transparency mechanisms amongst the P5, perhaps to be worked out within the nuclear transparency and security framework that originated in London in 2009 and held again in Paris in June, 2010. He underscored the importance of Track II processes, led by civil society institutions, that “keep up the pressure on nuclear weapon states to engage in a meaningful dialogue on strategic nuclear stability, in a world that is not just nuclear-armed but also cyber-armed.”



*General (ret.) T. Michael Moseley*

Parliamentarian **Mani Shankar Aiyar**, Chairman of the Indian Prime Minister’s Informal Group on Advancing the Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan for a Nuclear Weapons-Free and Nonviolent World Order, argued strongly in favor of India to take a leadership role, in 2012, to carry forward “the agenda of universal, non-discriminatory, phased, and verifiable steps, backed by the required collateral measures, for the elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction

*India can and must play an effective and credible role as the leader of a campaign for the goal of universal nuclear disarmament, both because India can bring to the campaign its moral strength deriving from six decades of consistently campaigning for nuclear disarmament but also now the weight of its growing presence in the international system...*

*The world and India need a security architecture that is not dependent on nuclear weapons, but neither can get it except in a world without nuclear weapons.*

- from the RGAP report, presented by Hon.  
Mani Shankar Aiyar

within an internationally agreed time-frame.” He also lent support for conferences “convened by interested States or civil society organizations” that “would give impetus in the broader comity of nations... to the considerations” urged by his Group to the Government of India.

**Jonathan Granoff**, President of the Global Security

Institute, argued for the “operationalization” of disarmament commitments, perhaps by way of an “ongoing forum in which nuclear disarmament is discussed and advanced on a regular, systematic basis.” Such an ongoing forum could lay to rest the tired argument about “whether to get rid of nuclear weapons” in favor of a debate over “how” to do so. Furthermore, it could instigate “the creation of a comprehensive framework that incorporates both incremental steps but ensures the clarity of purpose of disarmament.” Such an ongoing dialogue could also, possibly, instigate a “fast-track toward a convention with prompt commencement of preparatory work, leading to negotiations” should the requisite political will foment.

**Ambassador Richard Butler** of the Middle Powers Initiative proposed new means of accountability, new institutions of governance, such as “a Council on Weapons of Mass Destruction” or a revamped Security Council that does not privilege the five Nuclear Weapon States with immutable veto and/or permanence power. Ultimately, he argued, “we need to build a framework of globally supported institutions that would constitute a secure world [without nuclear weapons].”

**Dr. Teng Jianqun** of the Center for Arms Control and International Security Studies endorsed Chinese Premier Hu Jintao’s assertion that “when conditions are ripe, the other nuclear-armed countries should enter into a course of multilateral disarmament talks... in order to bring about complete and thorough nuclear disarmament” with the purpose of “formulat(ing) a feasible long-term plan with separate stages, including the establishment of a treaty on complete prohibition of nuclear weapons.”

Along with calling for implementation of already agreed upon measures—specifically those included in the 2000 and 2010 NPT Review Conferences—**Dr. William Potter** of the Center for Non-proliferation Studies proposed that the Secretary-General “devote a major address” to the topic of disarmament and non-proliferation education “as a way of focusing international attention on a vital but all too frequently neglected approach for combating ignorance and complacency and holding states accountable for their disarmament commitments.”

Recommendations and proposals also arose during the breakout sessions. At the session on accountability, hosted by the Permanent Mission of Kazakhstan, **Ambassador Libran Cabactulan** of the Philippines, Chair of the 2010 NPT Review Conference, recommended that countries strike nuclear weapons from their defense doctrines and take steps towards a convention outlawing nuclear weapons altogether. More immediately, Amb. Cabactulan stressed that it is “essential” to hold the Middle East Conference on a WMD free zone in 2012. US Ambassador Marcie Ries called for more participation in “the common effort to increase transparency and build confidence.” EWI Vice President **Greg Austin**, who moderated the Kazakh workshop, discussed the need to build political support for nuclear weapons elimination: “We need to take this discussion out of the UN and back into the public sphere.”



*Ambassador James Goodby*

At the session titled “Nuclear Weapons Convention or Framework of Agreements: Exploring Proposals for Nuclear Disarmament,” hosted by the Permanent Mission of Switzerland, **Ambassador James Goodby** of the Hoover Institution called for “a more comprehensive international effort... to consolidate and institutionalize” a process leading towards abolition. Such a process would be broad in scope and go beyond “a focus on nuclear issues” which “alone can only go so far in creating the conditions for a world without

nuclear weapons.” Such “ancillary agreements” that would establish security mechanisms and infrastructure would build inter-state confidence, enhance transparency and strengthen verification, enabling states to inch ever closer to the goal of “zero”. These steps, in effect, constitute the “building blocks” that would be in place to allow for a nuclear weapons treaty or convention to be most achievable, practical and effective.

The President of Pugwash, **Ambassador Jayantha Dhanapala**, offered several routes that could be pursued to strengthen the norm against nuclear weapons, such as the inclusion of nuclear weapons use in the International Criminal Court’s Rome Statute to make such use a war crime, the amendment of the Geneva Conventions to make explicit nuclear weapons’ violation of IHL, or a global boycott of banks and institutions that profit from the nuclear weapons industry.



*PNND Global Coordinator Alyn Ware chairs the panel at the German Mission. Ambassador Helmut Hoffmann hosted.*

One government delegate in the Swiss-sponsored discussion suggested a possible General Assembly resolution to further strengthen IHL’s applicability to nuclear weapons use. Ambassador Richard Butler of the Middle Powers Initiative voiced emphatic support for Ambassador Goodby’s focus on the security of a nuclear weapon-free world, and proposed that MPI work with middle power governments to establish an ongoing discussion of the governance structures that such a world would require.

Scores of recommendations were proposed at the Germany-hosted breakout session on “Parliamentary Actions for Nuclear Disarmament,” organized jointly by the network of Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation and disarmament and the Parliamentarian Network for Conflict Prevention, projects of GSI and EWI, respectively. Proposed largely by and for parliamentarians, these proposals included, *inter alia*:

- endorsement of existing joint parliamentary statements that support NWFZs in the Middle East and North East Asia;
- support the CTBT by organizing events in parliaments on the UN Day against Nuclear Tests;
- endorsement, including by citing it in parliamentary speeches, of the Vancouver Declaration on the incompatibility of nuclear weapons with international humanitarian law;
- adoption of resolutions affirming the incompatibility of nuclear weapons with IHL;
- adoption of legislation that prohibits and criminalizes nuclear weapons;
- divestment of public funds from corporations involved in the manufacture of nuclear weapons;
- adoption of resolutions supporting the Secretary-General’s Five Point Proposal for Nuclear Disarmament;
- holding of hearings on the legal, technical, political and institutional elements for a nuclear weapons-free world;
- reallocation of funds from nuclear weapons spending to disarmament and socio-economic needs.

These parliamentary focused recommendations are an extraordinarily important piece of the collaborative architecture required of a nuclear weapons-free world.



## **Evening Event**

In acknowledgment of the importance of the day's events, the Permanent Mission of India hosted a reception to honor the work of the co-sponsoring organizations, as well as the work of Mr. Shankar Aiyar.



*PNND Council Member Mani Shankar Aiyar is honored  
by Ambassador Puri and Mr. Granoff*

The evening began with an uplifting presentation by Deputy Permanent Representative Manjeev Singh Puri.

GSI is honored to have been so intimately involved with the work of this Advisory Group, whose report calls on the Indian Government to take a lead in global efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons. The report adopts many recommendations advanced by GSI, including those presented by former MPI Chairman Douglas Roche and current Chairman Ambassador Richard Butler, at the Rajiv Gandhi Commemorative Conference in 2008 and published in the book "Towards a Nuclear Weapon Free World," edited by Dr. Manpreet Sethi, a member of the Advisory Group.

The report further demonstrates the influence of the personal testimony of PNND Coordinator Alyn Ware to the Advisory Group earlier this year, as well as the letter sent to Prime Minister Singh and Congress President Sonia Gandhi by the World Academy of Art and Science, which was based on GSI President Jonathan Granoff's presentation to the WAAS in Delhi.

## **Conclusion**

While the conference did not seek to achieve a consensus on any of these recommendations, the organizers believe that many of these proposals offer a sound basis for advancing the moral and practical imperative of nuclear disarmament.

While the obstacles before us are formidable, and there exists an apparent hesitation amongst states to take the bold, yet achievable steps necessary to implement their political commitments, it is, to quote the closing words of plenary panelist Ambassador Dhanapala, "a moment for civil society, for the international community, to prepare for the next leap forward...this conference here today is a very useful beginning of this process."

## Links

- **View a photo gallery of the day's events; view more photos on Flickr:**

[http://www.gsainstitute.org/gsi/galleries/10\\_24\\_11/index.html](http://www.gsainstitute.org/gsi/galleries/10_24_11/index.html)

<http://www.flickr.com/photos/ewainstitute/sets/72157627955982953/>

Photos from the plenary sessions, the workshops and the evening reception are available for viewing.

- **Watch the video of the Secretary-General's presentation:** <http://vimeo.com/33795978>

In his keynote presentation, Mr. Ban emphasized the need for increased transparency and accountability, as well as the urgent need to strengthen the rule of law in nuclear disarmament obligations, and reiterated his 2008 call for work on a nuclear weapons convention.

Additionally, the full transcript of his remarks are available at: <http://www.un.org/sg/statements/index.asp?nid=5637>

- **Read the report of the plenaries by the EastWest Institute:** <http://www.ewi.info/ban-ki-moon-calls-nuclear-disarmament-ewi-forum>

The EWI report page also includes links to related papers and event reports from the EastWest Institute.

- **Read the report of the event from the *UN News Centre*,** “Dream of nuclear-weapon-free world is possible, Ban says,” <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=40169>

The *UN News Centre* report includes other relevant links, including to reports on other statements on disarmament made by Secretary-General Ban.

- **Read the full transcript of General Michael Moseley's presentation:** [http://www.ewi.info/system/files/OCT24GeneralMoseleyTalkingPoints2%200\\_0.doc](http://www.ewi.info/system/files/OCT24GeneralMoseleyTalkingPoints2%200_0.doc)
- **Read the full transcript of Mani Shankar Aiyar's presentation:** <http://www.gsainstitute.org/gsi/events/Oct242011/aiyar.doc>

Mr. Aiyar's presentation substantiated the launch of the RGAP Advisory Group report at the United Nations.

- **Read the report of Mr. Aiyar's presentation published in *The Economic Times*,** “No other country is as threatened as India is by N-weapons: Mani Shankar Aiyar,” [http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2011-10-25/news/30320326\\_1\\_nuclear-weapons-free-world-nuclear-stockpile-nuclear-disarmament](http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2011-10-25/news/30320326_1_nuclear-weapons-free-world-nuclear-stockpile-nuclear-disarmament)
- **Download the report of the Advisory Group to Revitalize the Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan:** <http://www.gsainstitute.org/gsi/docs/RGAP.pdf>

calls on the Indian Government to take a lead in global efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons. The report adopts many recommendations advanced by GSI, including those presented by former MPI Chairmen Douglas Roche and Ambassador Richard Butler, at the Rajiv Gandhi Commemorative Conference in 2008 and published in the book “Towards a Nuclear Weapon Free World,” edited by Dr. Manpreet Sethi, a member of the Advisory Group.

The report further demonstrates the influence of the personal testimony of PNND Coordinator Alyn Ware to the Advisory Group earlier this year, as well as the letter sent to Prime Minister Singh and Congress President Sonia Gandhi by the World Academy of Art and Science, which was based on GSI President Jonathan Granoff’s presentation to the WAAS in Delhi. See: [http://www.gsinstitute.org/gsi/archives/Singh\\_02\\_11.html](http://www.gsinstitute.org/gsi/archives/Singh_02_11.html)

- **Read the full transcript of Ambassador James Goodby’s presentation:** <http://www.gsinstitute.org/gsi/events/Oct242011/Goodby.docx>

Ambassador Goodby’s presentation was based on his article in Arms Control Today, published by the Arms Control Association, and is available at: [http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2011\\_05/Goodby](http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2011_05/Goodby)

- **Read a summary of the NWC workshop at the Swiss Mission,** “Nuclear Weapons Convention or Framework of Agreements: Exploring Proposals for Nuclear Disarmament,” <http://www.gsinstitute.org/gsi/events/Oct242011/nwc.html>



Remarks by John Edward Mroz

President, EastWest Institute

Good morning, Mr. Secretary General, your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen. It is my very great honor and pleasure to welcome all of you here today.

We are here mainly to review the progress that has been made since Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, three years ago to the date, challenged us all with his Five Point Plan.

When we met in 2008, I personally promised Secretary-General Ban that the EastWest Institute (EWI) will hold itself to the benchmarks that he set in his speech. And today, I'm proud to report that in the past three years, EWI has tirelessly worked to advance his vision.

Our latest effort, before our meeting today, was the series of meetings we convened in partnership with the Kazakh Mission and Ambassador Aitimova that we called the *Nuclear Discussion Forum*.

Over the past year, the Nuclear Discussion Forum acted as a laboratory of innovative thinking and gave its members, many of whom are here with us today, the crucial chance to speak frankly and bridge east-west and north-south divides on the most pressing roadblocks to nuclear disarmament.

The report on the proceedings of the forum is available here in front of all of you.

Also, in front of you, are copies of today's program, and as you can see we have events scheduled all day around this topic.

Following the plenary sessions, we have five breakout groups organized by all three partner organizations and generously being hosted by five of the permanent missions. I urge you all to attend at least one of the sessions where you will get a chance to actively be part of the debate.

In the coming weeks, we will be publishing a report on the day's proceedings and we will be looking for your creative ideas and out-of-the-box thinking to outline the road ahead.

Thank you all for joining us this morning.

## Remarks by Francis Finlay

Co-Chairman, EastWest Institute

Good morning, Mr. Secretary General, Ban Ki-moon, Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen. It is my very great honor and pleasure to introduce our key-note speaker today for this discussion intended to add momentum to our efforts to eliminate nuclear weapons.

Mr. Secretary General, your leadership in this field, as in so many other areas of peace, conflict and human security is admired around the world. We at the EastWest Institute hold you in high regard, especially for your five-point plan for nuclear disarmament announced three years ago at a similar forum at the United Nations on United Nations Day, hosted by our institute, along with our partners today, the Global Security Institute and the James Martin Center for Non-Proliferation Studies.

The momentum since then has been palpable as all in this room can attest.

In December 2009, the prime ministers of Japan and Australia presented the report of the international commission on nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament, “eliminating nuclear threats: a practical agenda for global policymakers”. The commission made a strong plea for the continued delegitimization of nuclear weapons.

Among the most significant of the report’s 76 recommendations are:

- the setting of a medium term ‘minimization point’ target - to be reached by 2025 - of a world with less than 2,000 nuclear warheads - a more than 90 per cent reduction of present nuclear arsenals.
- a suggested approach to moving forward the issue of a weapons of mass destruction free zone in the middle east. .... and....
- a plea for early movement by the nuclear-armed states on refining their nuclear doctrine to limit the role of nuclear weapons, ... on those states giving unequivocal assurances that their nuclear weapons will not be used against non-nuclear weapons states, ... and for a rethinking by all states of existing approaches to ‘extended deterrence’.

In March 2010, the United States and Russia negotiated the New Start treaty that will significantly reduce their nuclear arsenals.

In April 2010, 47 states committed to strengthen nuclear security and reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism at the nuclear security summit in Washington DC.

Also in 2010, the five-yearly NPT review conference unanimously adopted an ambitious 64-point action plan on nonproliferation, disarmament, and peaceful use of nuclear energy with a view to the “total elimination of nuclear weapons.”

There are also numerous significant civil society initiatives to advance nuclear disarmament. For example, the nuclear security project of NTI, Global Zero, the Middle Powers Initiative, the Nobel Peace Laureates Summit, and the United Religions Initiative are but a few.

However, we should not ignore the insight of the prestigious Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) in its yearbook 2011 in addressing the cuts in the arsenals of Russia and U.S. under

the new start treaty. The yearbook noted that: "both countries currently are either deploying new nuclear weapon delivery systems, or have announced programmes to do so, and appear determined to retain their nuclear arsenals for the indefinite future."

A similar situation of modernizing or expanding nuclear forces can be seen in other countries with nuclear weapons.

Mr. Secretary General, your five-point plan from 24 October 2008 served as a necessary foundation for progress made by states in the three years since then. Your strong voice and moral authority on this issue are still needed. Can I invite you to address our meeting today?

# **Pacta Sunt Servanda: Promises to Keep**

**United Nations Day**

**October 24, 2011**

**United Nations, New York City, New York**

**Conference Title:**

***Nuclear Disarmament: A Compass Point for Progress and Accountability***

**Jonathan Granoff, President Global Security Institute, [www.gs institute.org](http://www.gs institute.org)**

On United Nations Day, three years ago Secretary General Ban Ki-moon set forth a compass point for international cooperation to eliminate nuclear weapons and to make the world safer on the path to this achievement. In addition to calling for work on a nuclear weapons convention or a framework of instruments to achieve disarmament, he called for entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, negotiations of a fissile material treaty, entry into force of the Protocols to regional nuclear weapons free zones, and efforts to establish a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, as well as the development of new norms for space weapons, missiles and conventional arms.

The Secretary General's Five Point Proposal remains relevant today and can help inspire work in many different forums and levels of diplomacy and civil society. It upholds a clear goal and emphasizes the incremental steps needed to get there. Such bold leadership will be needed to fulfill the aspiration, expressed so eloquently by President Obama, as "the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons," which will constitute in the words of Secretary General Ban Ki-moon, "a global public good of the highest order."

Failure to achieve greater progress in fulfilling this moral and practical imperative will result in cynicism toward the most important tool the world presently has to ensure peace --- solemnly negotiated and agreed upon commitments. Without such explicit commitments -- conventions, treaties -- we rely upon ad hoc arrangements which are only as strong as short term perceived interests. With treaties norms are set and common purposes achievable.

But, these explicit arrangements are only as strong as the integrity of the parties and their adherence to them. The term in international law to remember is *pacta sunt servanda* -- agreements must be kept and honored in good faith. Or, in the words of President Obama: "words must mean something."

The 2010 Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review's Final Statement, contains a reaffirmation of an "unequivocal undertaking to accomplish", not just to aspire, but "to accomplish the total elimination of nuclear weapons,"

It calls upon states “to undertake concrete disarmament efforts...” in fact “special efforts to establish the necessary framework to achieve and maintain a world without nuclear weapons.” It highlights that this is a matter that requires our most committed actions by saying “there is an urgent need”.

“Urgent”, “concrete”, “unequivocal” – These are strong words requiring the strongest of actions.

Many of us were heartened by the attention paid to the progressive five point agenda of the Secretary General’s Five Point proposal and particularly reference to a convention or framework of instruments to achieve the elimination of nuclear weapons.

Without such clarity of purpose the dynamism required to achieve significant threat reducing steps will be difficult to obtain. Thus we are now seeing how difficult it is just to achieve the very modest incremental steps, such as a fissile materials treaty or strengthening IAEA safeguards, needed to enhance everyone’s security. The galvanizing effect of collectively seeking the common goal of a nuclear weapons free world will make all the steps needed to move there so much easier.

In the recent United States Nuclear Posture Review, there is a "commitment to a nuclear weapons-free world" and there is even a commitment "to initiate a comprehensive national research and development program to support continued progress toward a world free of nuclear weapons," including, but not limited to, "expanded work on verification technologies."

What have we seen since these commitments were made?

Nearly every state with nuclear weapons seems to be upgrading, expanding, or modernizing their weapons. For example in the United States, as part of the negotiations for obtaining the START treaty, a new commitment was made to allocate potentially over 200 billion dollars to modernize the arsenal – modernizing delivery systems and modernizing weapons. There may also be some commitment to initiating a comprehensive national research and development program, as called for in the Nuclear Posture Review, but if any funds have been allocated to this task, they are dwarfed by the commitment to modernize the arsenal.

The language of the final statement of the NPT Review Conference is very consistent with initiating a comprehensive research and development program at an international level. And if anything is needed now, it is a clear, unambiguous, unequivocal, irreversible, well-funded effort by like-minded states, or all states if possible, on laying out the framework necessary to obtain and maintain a nuclear weapons-free world. There is no ongoing forum in which nuclear disarmament is being discussed and advanced on a daily, regular, systematic basis. There is language, there are statements, but we don’t see the institutionalization, we don’t see the commitment being operationalized and that’s what’s really important.



Without such a clear course of action, we become subject to backsliding. The ongoing debate should be about *how* to get rid of nuclear weapons. Yet, continually we are forced to return to the argument *whether* we should get rid of nuclear weapons. That argument should have been laid to rest in 2000, when the “unequivocal undertaking” to elimination was made at that NPT Review Conference.

I assure you, we will again be faced with bureaucracies and think-tanks and politicians who will force us to revisit the argument whether we should get rid of nuclear weapons again and again unless we lay out the framework or proceed to negotiate the preparatory process for a nuclear weapons convention.

Some people say working on a framework or convention is a distraction from the NPT. I very much disagree with that analysis. The NPT contemplates subsidiary instruments to fulfill its non-proliferation and disarmament purposes. Nobody argues that a test ban treaty is a distraction from the non-proliferation purposes of the NPT or that a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty is a distraction. The NPT contemplates subsidiary instruments. We need subsidiary instruments to achieve non-proliferation goals and likewise to achieve disarmament goals. It is to fulfill the disarmament pillar of the NPT that a framework of agreements or a convention is needed.

Some people say there are many preconditions to beginning this process. There seems to be a proliferation of preconditions. For some the precondition is the elimination of bad people. For others it's the elimination of bad states. For others it's a utopian world in utter harmony. But there is no language in the Final Statement of the NPT Review and there is no language in the Nuclear Posture Review that there are preconditions to beginning this process of making progress to move toward negotiating the elimination of nuclear weapons. There is no legal basis for that position.

It is a political basis and it is for countries' leaders, and all of us, to educate the public on the consequences of not commencing to more substantially work on nuclear disarmament now.

There appear to be three paths before us:

One is ad hoc incremental steps with numerous preconditions before actually commencing the real work of negotiating disarmament.

Two is beginning the creation of a comprehensive framework that incorporates both incremental steps, but insures the clarity of purpose of disarmament, thus forming a basis to critique diversions from the disarmament process and a context to integrate many programs and approaches.

Third is a fast-track toward a convention with prompt commencement of preparatory work, leading to negotiations as early as possible.

I think the latter two are much preferred and the ad hoc incremental approach is proving to be too slow.

I believe that what can drive this process is the understanding that nuclear weapons are morally, culturally, and humanly repugnant.

Imagine if the Biological Weapons Convention said that no countries can use smallpox or polio as a weapon, but nine countries can use the plague as a weapon. We would all say this is incoherent and utterly immoral. We recognize that the plague is unacceptable.

The weapon itself is unacceptable. It is not legitimate, legal, or moral for any country, good or bad, to use or threaten to use such a weapon. Such conduct would clearly violate our most basic universal civilized standards which are embodied in international humanitarian law. That is why in the final statement of the 2010 NPT Review Process one of the most important elements is the explicit, positive, and unambiguous commitment to the application of international humanitarian law in nuclear weapons policy.

This is an area for nuclear disarmament advocacy that should be utilized very forcefully. International humanitarian law is the body of law that governs the use of force in war. It prohibits the use of weapons that are unable to discriminate between civilians and combatants. It necessitates that all weapons must be proportionate to specific military objectives. They must not cause unnecessary or aggravated suffering even to combatants. They must not affect states that are not parties to the conflict, and they must not cause severe, widespread, or long-term damage to the environment. The International Court of Justice in its landmark advisory opinion on the legality of nuclear weapons highlighted the fact that it is impossible to control nuclear weapons in space and time.

Indeed, one can with great imagination imagine certain uses that would be compliant with international humanitarian law. A depth charge in the high seas might do so. A small nuke in a desert might do so. But the vast majority of missions and deployments of nuclear weapons are not those exceptions. The vast majority of deployments and missions of nuclear weapons violate those principles of international humanitarian law. That highlights the need to operationalize creating the framework of instruments needed to eliminate nuclear weapons, begin the preparatory process for a convention and begin that process now.

The threat covers everyone on the planet and thus every state, not just nuclear weapon states, have a responsibility to start this process.

There are no good reasons to wait and there are many good reasons to seize this political moment, a moment where those states that possess nuclear weapons are not existential enemies.

The global economy has become one fabric. Today, as never before, we are communicating ideas, passions, and art without borders. We share a common climate, common oceans, and it is time that we realized we share a common future. The security our children deserve requires global security with multinational cooperation based on the rule of law. When it comes to nuclear weapons, the pursuit of national self interest must not be distorted by the provincialism of national myopia. Realism requires common efforts. It is in the interest of

every nation to work to eliminate nuclear weapons. We live in one world. It is time that we started living in a civilized fashion. As the late Senator Alan Cranston used to say, "Nuclear weapons are unworthy of civilization." We have to get rid of them. Thank you.

**Dr. William Potter**

**“Toward Accountability of States for Eliminating Nuclear Weapons”**

**UN Workshop on Nuclear Disarmament**

**(October 24, 2011)**

Mr. Chair, your Excellencies, friends, and colleagues, it is my great privilege to participate in this important meeting. On behalf of the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute, I am very pleased for the organization I direct to co-sponsor this event. Unfortunately, that privilege does not provide me with any additional time for my remarks, so I will be very brief and to the point. Most of my observations pertain to what was and what was not achieved at the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

**I. The 2010 Final Document:**

1. The Action Plan: The first observation I would make is that an extremely important innovation at the Review Conference was the focus from Day 1 on developing specific forward-looking recommendations in the form of action items. The great virtue of this innovation is that we now have a scorecard with 64 specific benchmarks covering all of the Treaty’s three pillars against which NPT States parties can and should be judged during the current five-year review cycle.

It is absolutely essential for the international community—and especially the NGO community—to focus the spot light on state implementation of the commitments that they undertook in 2010. All states short report on what they have done during the past two years at the 2012 NPT PrepCom, while outside bodies should render their independent assessments. In this regard, the reports being prepared on this topic by Reaching Critical Will and my Center will highlight both positive steps that are being taken and the substantial amount that remains to be done.

2. Disarmament provisions both more and less than meet the eye. My second observation pertains to the disarmament provisions in the Final Document, which are both more and less than meets the eye. On the one hand, they contain a number of new and very positive elements, including the first reference in a Rev Con consensus document on the importance of implementing the recommendations of the UN Experts Group on Disarmament and Nonproliferation Education (Action Item 22), reference to the five-point proposal by UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon for nuclear disarmament, which proposes, *inter alia* “consideration of negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention....,” and recognizes the humanitarian dimension to the problem of nuclear weapons. The document’s language on certain benchmarks for disarmament, however, is actually weaker in some respects than that included in the “13 Practical Steps” from the 2000 Rev Con, specifically with respect to reduction of the role of nuclear weapons in security doctrines, reduction of operational status of nuclear weapons, and enhanced transparency. Unlike 2000, the 2010 Final Document makes no specific reference to the need for further reduction in non-strategic nuclear weapons despite the very strong appeal for such action at the Rev Con by many countries, including those from NATO. This omission, which Russia insisted upon, was not opposed by the United States. Perhaps most significantly, the consensus Final Document masks the very pronounced divergence of views between the NWS and NNWS over disarmament matters—a gulf that actually was much larger than many had anticipated following the so-called arms control spring of 2010. Thus, although Egypt was able to persuade NAM to support a consensus Rev Con document because it included language it sought on the Middle East, this “consensus” should not be interpreted as very deep, especially as it relates to disarmament issues. Perhaps indicative of the fragility of this consensus was the unwillingness of the United States (presumably with input from its P-3 partners) to support a reference simply noting verbatim language from the Rev Con Final Document on a nuclear weapons convention when it was inserted in a draft text of the document from the Nuclear Disarmament Conference in Astana, Kazakhstan two weeks ago.

3. Role for NNWS as well as NWS. One does not need to remind this audience about the pressing need to gain adherence and full implementation by all NWS to existing

disarmament and nonproliferation treaties. These treaties include, but are not limited to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the NPT, and the various treaties establishing NWFZs in different regions of the world. That being said, the same dictate should apply with equal force to all NNWS, including those NAM members who most pride themselves on adherence to principled disarmament positions.

For example, 10 NAM members and observers still have not signed the CTBT and another 23 NAM members and observers have yet to ratify the CTBT. While some of these states may choose to link their ratification to that of the United States, it is not obvious that his strategy has a beneficial effect.

One can make a similar argument with respect to implementation of the provisions of NWFZs. It is the case, for example, that while there has been significant progress in recent years involving NWFZs, one of the major setbacks involves the “collective amnesia” on the part of many states parties to NWFZ treaties regarding their commitments not to engage in nuclear trade with countries lacking full scope safeguards. These provisions are explicit in the Treaties of Raratonga and Pelindaba, and the Central Asian NWFZ Treaty is even more restrictive in its insistence that recipient countries have in place the Additional Protocol to the IAEA. Unfortunately, a number of countries chose to ignore these legally-binding NWFZ obligations, as well as related political obligations undertaken at the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference, when they supported an exemption for India at the 2008 meeting of the Nuclear Suppliers Group and subsequently engaged in nuclear trade negotiations with India. Just as it is intolerable for NWS to selectively pick and choose those NPT obligations to which they subscribe, so it is impermissible for NNWS to ignore economically inconvenient legal and/or political commitments they have undertaken. To do so is to undermine their moral authority on nuclear disarmament matters.

My point here is not to distract attention from the need to hold the NWS responsible for their disarmament commitments, but to suggest that there are also disarmament steps that also could usefully be undertaken by NNWS.



5. Ignorance and Complacency: Three years ago when I had occasion to address a similar forum at the UN with the Secretary General I focused my remarks exclusively on the often neglected nuclear danger posed by **ignorance and complacency** about issues of disarmament and nonproliferation. It was then the case and it remains embarrassing to me as an educator how woefully ill-informed most American students, citizens, and their elected officials are about international affairs in general and nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation in particular. Although this low knowledge base is deplorable, it also is understandable given the typical absence of opportunities for study of the subject. Few U.S. high schools have curricula that expose students to issues of disarmament or weapons proliferation and strategies for their control and my tiny graduate school in Monterey is one of only two in the world to offer a graduate degree in the subject. As a result, at a time when there is a pressing need for new thinking about nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation matters, there are few venues available for training the next generation of specialists or for introducing our future leaders to these subjects.

I suspect the educational deficit I have described is not only an American problem. How many high schools, universities, and graduate programs internationally offer training in the field of nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation? How deep a pool of arms control and nonproliferation experts is there for example in the Russian Federation, or China or Japan or Korea or France or India or Indonesia who are sufficiently knowledgeable to monitor nuclear developments and hold states accountable for their commitments to eliminate nuclear weapons? Indeed, where are we going to find the necessary number of professor to teach our young students the skills they will need to function effectively as arms control diplomats and analysts and advocates?

Nine years ago almost to this date, a UN Experts Group on Disarmament and Nonproliferation Education made 34 practical recommendations, which were adopted by the UN General Assembly. The **good news** is that no states have voiced opposition to the recommendations. The **bad news** is that few states have paid much attention to them, and little progress has been made in the intervening years in translating support in principle into meaningful action.

What I would humbly propose by way of conclusion is that if the Secretary-General shares my concerns about the importance of the subject of disarmament and nonproliferation education, which I believe he does, it would be tremendously useful were he to devote a major address to the topic as a way of focusing international attention on a vital but all too frequently neglected approach for combating ignorance and complacency and holding states accountable for their disarmament commitments.





[WWW.EWI.INFO](http://WWW.EWI.INFO)

[WWW.GSINSTITUTE.ORG](http://WWW.GSINSTITUTE.ORG)

[CNS.MIIS.EDU](mailto:CNS.MIIS.EDU)

*report written and designed by Rhianna Tyson Kreger*