

*Opening Remarks*

**The Simons Foundation and  
Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada**

**GRADUATE RESEARCH AWARDS DEBATES**

Lester B. Pearson Building  
Ottawa, Canada

February 21, 2014

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

Good Morning,

It is a pleasure to be here, participating again, with Madame Isabelle Roy and her colleagues in the annual Graduate Research Awards seminar, a joint programme of the International Security Research and Outreach Programme of the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, and The Simons Foundation.

We have now enjoyed a twelve-year partnership in a programme that I believe is a worthwhile contribution in the development of specialist expertise on Canadian Foreign Policy in Disarmament in universities across Canada.

I am sure I can speak for both the Foreign Affairs and The Simons Foundation to say we are pleased to provide students, in this field, with the opportunity to contribute to Canada's foreign policy, to benefit financially, and to a possible path for future career choice.

The programme is organized and managed expertly and efficiently by Jasmin Cheung-Gertler, of the Department, and Elaine Hynes from The Simons Foundation. They are to be congratulated for their continuing excellent organization of this event.

Congratulations also to the recipients of this year's Awards. I am looking forward to the Debates on the Humanitarian Dimensions of Nuclear Weapons; on the Middle East Weapons of Mass Destruction Free Zone free of Weapons and the NPT; Counter Proliferation and Iran; and on an enlargement of membership in the Australia Group export control regime. These subjects are among the critical issues of the time and I wish all debaters much success and look forward to the outcome.

The question on the Humanitarian Dimensions of Nuclear Weapons is timely because just last week the Second Conference on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons, hosted by the Government of Mexico, took place. Canada was well-represented with a three-member Canadian Government Delegation, four members of Canada's academic and NGO community, and by Canadian citizen and Hiroshima survivor, Setsuko Thurlow, who gave a most moving presentation.

The number of states represented grew by nineteen from the first conference in Oslo, bringing the total to 146. Before the event, the Government of Austria announced that Austria would convene a third conference before the end of this year. I understand that South Africa and New Zealand will also host further conferences.

It was disappointing, but not unexpected, that the nuclear weapons NPT member states did not participate. Though the momentum is certainly growing to prohibit nuclear weapons on the grounds that they are a threat to humanity and contrary to International Humanitarian Law, is difficult to know if these conferences will move the issue of nuclear disarmament forward. Until the NPT nuclear weapons states engage progress will be difficult.

A few months ago, I heard that the United States regretted not participating in the Oslo Conference and planned to be present in Mexico. However, - and this may be just gossip - I was told at the conference that the list of conditions they wished to impose was unacceptable.

The Center for Strategic and International Studies, a Washington organization, concerned that some NATO “governments are supporting and encouraging opposition to NATO’s policy of nuclear deterrence,” encouraged the three NATO nuclear states to participate in order to make the case for deterrence, and argued that these conferences on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons will tilt “the balance between disarmament and non-proliferation in the NPT regime”<sup>1</sup> - in effect treating the NPT as a static entity, rather than - in essence - a Treaty for the non-proliferation and elimination of nuclear weapons.

The Simons Foundation’s work on nuclear disarmament is primarily carried out through Global Zero of which I am Founding Partner. Interest was expressed in the Global Zero Action Plan. Bruce Blair, the Co-Founder of Global Zero, and a panellist at this conference, was approached by several of the official delegates including the Austrian Ambassador all of whom expressed interest in the Global Zero Action Plan.

The Global Zero Action Plan is a step-by-step plan for the phased, verifiable, multilateral elimination of all nuclear weapons by 2030, accompanied by a legally binding accord which would be negotiated in Phase III of the plan - 2019-2023 - a plan consistent with Point One of UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon’s 5-point Proposal for nuclear disarmament: *a framework of separate, mutually reinforcing instruments.*

Here last year, I presented my thoughts on the prospects for nuclear disarmament following the re-election of President Obama. I was overly optimistic and did not take into consideration the possible outcome of Mr. Putin’s return to the Presidency. President Obama, in his speech in Berlin *did* announce that he would “seek negotiated cuts with Russia” to the nuclear arsenals - and his intention was to seek cuts to 1000 - the number consistent with the Global Zero Action Plan. And, as well, to “seek *bold* reductions in U.S. and Russian tactical weapons in Europe.”

Following the Berlin speech, President Obama wrote a letter to President Putin which was not answered for months, partly because Edward Snowden came on the scene, and the moment was lost. President Putin has now added space security to the previously named existing obstacles to further reductions - (missile defence, CFE and conventional weapons.)

I *have* heard that the United States believes there is a possibility for success in negotiating the removal of tactical weapons from Europe. There is the pressure of economic issues, US budget, cost of the B-21 upgrade; and in Europe, political and

---

<sup>1</sup> “CSIS European Trilateral Nuclear Dialogue 2013 Consensus Statement 24 January 2014” [www.CSIS.ORG](http://www.CSIS.ORG)

budget issues around the purchase of necessary replacement aircraft. It is commonly agreed that in NATO “everything depends on where the United States stands.”<sup>2</sup> Article 5 of the NATO document states that elimination of tactical nuclear weapons from Europe requires reciprocity from Russia. So if President Obama is serious, the approach for the US would be to have the reciprocity condition removed from the NATO document; or, alternately for the US to unilaterally repatriate its tactical nuclear weapons.

President Obama does have the power under the US Constitution to act unilaterally, to make unilateral cuts to the nuclear arsenals. He does not require the approval of Congress. And he *has* announced that he intends to use this power in order to achieve some portions of his agenda.

Two years ago, at the Munich Security Conference, Global Zero presented its NATO-Russia Commission Report on Removing *U.S. and Russian Tactical Nuclear Weapons from European Combat Bases*. [I do have 2 copies of this Report with me]

Global Zero has now has partnered with the Chicago Council on Global Affairs on a Task Force on *Removing Nuclear Weapons in Europe*. The President of the Chicago Council on Global Affairs is Ivo Daalder, Former U.S. Permanent Representative to NATO, an Obama appointee.

The Task Force, co-Chaired by former US Secretary of State, Madeline Albright and Sir Malcolm Rifkind, the current Chair of Intelligence and Security Committee in the British Parliament, will develop recommendations for a pathway “for reducing nuclear threats facing Europe and improving alliance deterrence of common threats.” The first meeting was held on the sidelines of this year’s Munich Security Conference and the next will be in London on March 10<sup>th</sup>.

*I am going to stray from my comments and say that*

I was disappointed that there was no representation from Canada at the Munich Security Conference, the key global security conference with representation from the highest level of governments.

My perception from the conference was that a rhetorical Cold War – hopefully only rhetorical - was taking place with an aggressive anti-Russian statement from NATO Secretary-General, Anders Fogg Rasmussen; followed by a rebuke from Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov, who said that he had met with Mr. Fogg Rasmussen and none of this was mentioned; and that it would be more appropriate to present these views to the NATO-Russian Council rather than to an audience.

Lavrov’s comments were essentially directed at East-West divisions with reference to the early “hope for a common European home” the more relevant “space” provided by the

---

<sup>2</sup> Oliver Meier and Simon Lunn, “Trapped: NATO, Russia, and the Problem of Tactical Nuclear Weapons” [www.armscontrol.org](http://www.armscontrol.org). January/February 2014

OSCE, “the goal to create a common European, European Atlantic and Eurasian security community.” He talked of “collective successes” such as Syria and Iran. He was critical of “the plan to create the European segment of the US Anti-ballistic Missile” which he referred to as adding “a ‘nuclear-missile shield’ to the ‘nuclear sword’”.<sup>3</sup>

Mr. Lavrov was asked about, and declined to comment on, the possible violation of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty and I believe that the Obama Administration, having “not formally confirmed” the “alleged breach” is in a quandary over how to address it.<sup>4</sup>

U.S. Secretary of State, John Kerry, focussed on US-European relations, mentioned the help of Russia, but only along with several other states, in removing chemical weapons from Syria; and in reaching agreement with Iran on rolling back its nuclear programme.

There was mutual sniping on interference in the Ukraine etc. And generally, it appeared that the earlier *reset* of US-Russia relations has become an *upset*. So the prospects for reciprocal major cuts to the U.S. and Russian arsenals looks exceedingly bleak – at least from the Russian side. The United States may decide to repatriate its nuclear weapons.

In order to maintain the momentum of nuclear reductions and disarmament, and to maintain relations, or overcome the current stalemate, with Russia, it is wise to seek [explore?] other avenues which hopefully would lead back to the main road. The opening of Iran may lead to this route.

Global Zero - in partnership with the Russian International Affairs Council (RIAC) - is creating a task force on the Middle East Weapons of Mass Destruction Free Zone. The task force is co-chaired by Igor Ivanoff, Former Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs and Tom Pickering, former U.S. Ambassador, with strong involvement from Nabil Fahmy, the current Egyptian Foreign Minister and with support from the King Faisal for Research and Islamic Studies. It will be a Track one-and-a-half event bringing together 30-40 current and former senior government officials from key countries in the Middle East – including Israel (Israel has agreed to participate) and the United States, Russia and Europe. The task is to develop a politically and technically actionable framework for governments to establish a verifiable WMD-free zone in the Middle East. The first meeting of the group will be in Rome in June of this year.

All of this is relevant to today’s debates and I have gone on long enough! So I will now reiterate my deep interest in your subjects, and again, I wish you all well in the debates.

Thank you!

---

<sup>3</sup> [www.mid.ru/brp\\_4.nsf/0/90C4D89F4BF2B54344257C76002ACE67](http://www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/0/90C4D89F4BF2B54344257C76002ACE67), 05/02/2014

<sup>4</sup> “Russia-U.S. Arms Control Malaise, *Basic* 10/02/14

