

*Opening Remarks*

**The Simons Foundation  
and Global Affairs Canada**

**GRADUATE RESEARCH AWARDS  
SEMINAR**

Lester B. Pearson Building  
Ottawa, Canada

February 9, 2017

*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 Chris Conway of the Global Affairs, and Elaine Hynes, from The Simons Foundation, for their excellent organization and management of, what I believe is, a unique partnership programme.

Disarmament education is an essential requirement in the modern world yet remains there are few educational initiatives in schools and universities for 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 one of the most lucrative of all businesses.

Weapon development has gone far beyond the needs of national and international security. Each new development is followed by its counter – spiralling upward to a catastrophic destruction potential.

I am very pleased - therefore - to welcome to Canada Professor M.V. Ramana, our Keynote Speaker who has just become the new Simons Chair in Disarmament, Global and Human Security at the University of British Columbia - the only Disarmament Chair in Canada. Professor Ramana, with his knowledge and expertise in disarmament, will be a great resource in Canada, for the government, the universities and the community at large.

And I welcome, and congratulate the recipients of the Graduate Research Awards; and commend you for your choice of study - for your specialization in issues of weapons of mass destruction - nuclear weapons, nuclear proliferation, and chemical weapons, which despite the Chemical Weapons Ban, are being used and remain a cause of concern. I hope that you will continue to focus on these, and pursue career paths in academia, the foreign service, politics or the NGO world in civil society.

I welcome the appointment of the Honourable Chrystia Freeland to Foreign Minister. I understand that the reason for this appointment is her expertise in trade negotiations, and connected to the renegotiation of NAFTA. It is my hope that the government will *not* prioritize trade relations over human rights and human security issues - *will not* compromise deeply held Canadian principles and values; and will also support Mexico, Canada's good friend and partner, to prevent the US Administration from destroying its economy.

It is heartening that Prime Minister Trudeau spoke out for an “open society and open immigration” and to “welcome refugees regardless of faith,” in response to the human rights abuses perpetrated by the new U.S. Administration. It is most important, as well, that the larger human security issues - particularly nuclear disarmament - be treated as priority issues.

Of most concern to me is the danger of nuclear war – deliberate or inadvertent – of a nuclear detonation by miscalculation, accident or intention which could result in nuclear attack and retaliatory counter-attack; the consequences of which would be catastrophic. I imagine we all know that the Atomic Scientists Doomsday Clock moved forward 30 seconds to two-and-a-half minutes to Midnight and aware of the reasons for this. <sup>1</sup>

The current political climate adds to this danger – the politically troubling world of growing nationalism, xenophobia, deteriorating relations between Russia and United States, their nuclear sabre-rattling; and disintegrating international relations caused by a new aggressive U.S. Administration.

The Graduate Research Awards for Disarmament, Arms Control and Non-Proliferation programme began in 2003, - during the Liberal era – at a time when Canada’s Foreign Policy was grounded in Human Security. The Cold War had ended and we imagined a future of global peace, and believed that we would see the end of nuclear weapons. The weapons numbers have come down but enough remain to destroy life as we know it.

Nuclear disarmament has stalled. The nuclear weapons states are upgrading their weapons and infrastructure, planning for their retention into the distant future; developing new capabilities for the weapons, with Russia developing new weapons. Pakistan and India are in a constant state of tension. North Korea is rapidly becoming a serious nuclear threat.

The will of the majority of Canadians - and the right – is to live in a nuclear weapon free world.

Like so many Canadians, I was disappointed – and *disheartened* - that Canada voted *against* the UN Resolution to negotiate a nuclear ban treaty; and that Canada had not, at least abstained from the vote - like fellow NATO member, The Netherlands.

My preference, however, like that of the Government of Canada, would have been for a Nuclear Weapons Convention, which held the expectation that - at some point - the nuclear weapons states would join.

It is my hope, however, that Canada will actively engage in the upcoming negotiations for the ban treaty.

Former Foreign Minister Dion, in his October 28<sup>th</sup> speech justified Canada’s “NO” vote citing concern about weakening the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and stated Canada’s preference – its support for - the so-called incremental step-by-step approach prioritized by the nuclear weapons states, NATO and other US Defence allies.

---

<sup>1</sup> Deteriorating relations between U.S and Russia; stalled nuclear disarmament modernizations, new Russian weapons in U.S. and new capabilities; Pakistan and India tensions, North Korea; Unpredictability of new US President

Yet it is the non-nuclear weapons states which, so far, provide the strength to the NPT. The treaty is weakened by the nuclear weapons states which are not eliminating their weapons. Not only that! They are upgrading, developing new capabilities, funding, and planning for their indefinite retention. And Russia is said to be developing new weapons. - Furthermore, Russia and the United States are threatening to use them. This repudiation of their commitment seriously weakens the treaty.

And the nuclear weapons states themselves, are the obstacles in the step-by-step path.

The three steps Mr. Dion named – NPT Universality, Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Entry-into-Force, and the Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty - have been – for the most part – repudiated by the nuclear weapons states and support for these steps seems like empty rhetoric - dissimulation.

Take universality of the NPT: four out of nine states with nuclear weapons - *almost half* - are not party to the NPT. Israel refuses to confirm that it has nuclear weapons; North Korea has withdrawn. Pakistan and India refuse to join as non-nuclear weapons states – they want to be part of what India called the “nuclear weapons club”. Yet it is not a club.

The reason that there are nuclear weapons states within the NPT is that five states possessed nuclear weapons when the NPT was initiated and entered into force. At this time, in order to stop nuclear weapons proliferation, these states committed to eliminate their arsenals (Pillar 1 of the Treaty) in exchange for commitment that other states would remain nuclear weapon free (Pillar 2) but would be able to obtain nuclear technology for peaceful purposes (Pillar 3).

TAKE the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty [the CTBT]: Four nuclear weapons states, North Korea, Israel, India and Pakistan have not signed the CTBT. Eight more states must ratify the CTBT before it can enter into force. Six of the nine nuclear weapons states - *two-thirds* - the United States, China - both NPT parties - , North Korea, Israel, India and Pakistan - have not ratified the Treaty.

TAKE the Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty, [the FMCT]: Canada is putting its efforts into advancing the negotiations of the FMCT which Pakistan has long opposed. Yet Canada’s latest endeavor – a praiseworthy initiative - calls for consensus rather than a UN Majority Vote and it is most likely that opposition again from Pakistan will result in another failure.

Until the nuclear weapons states remove their stumbling blocks from the step-by-step plan nothing will change. And I cannot understand why Canada continues to support this.

On October 17<sup>th</sup>, before the vote for the nuclear weapons ban and eleven days prior to Mr. Dion’s speech, the United States presented a Non-Paper, entitled Defense Impacts of Potential United Nations General Assembly Nuclear Weapons Ban Treaty, to NATO member delegations to urging them to vote against negotiations for a nuclear weapons ban treaty, and further, if negotiations do commence to “refrain from joining them”.

According to this leaked document, a ban treaty, would “delegitimize the concept of nuclear deterrence” policy and theory. And even prior to its entry into force, the ban treaty would seriously affect and curtail the current ability for nuclear weapons nuclear defence operations.

The Non-Paper lists twenty-one nuclear war planning elements which would be affected, and include the development, testing, production, acquisition, possession, stockpiling, some of which, like nuclear sharing is already prohibited.<sup>2</sup>

John Burroughs, International Lawyer and Simons Fellow, agrees that the Ban Treaty “could impact non-parties as well as parties” to the treaty; that it would, however, further the process of nuclear disarmament. “A prohibition treaty,” he says, would have the beneficial effect of erecting a further barrier to the spread of nuclear weapons.” It could “strengthen non-proliferation obligations. It could perhaps “prohibit the development of nuclear weapons” or “prohibit the production of plutonium and highly enriched uranium.” If nothing else, it would reinforce the norm against nuclear weapons use.<sup>3</sup> It seems as though the writing is on the wall, the death knell of nuclear weaponry and nuclear war.

It is in the best interests of Canadians – and I am sure the will of the majority of Canadians - for Canada to actively engage in the nuclear weapon ban negotiations – and to negotiate in good faith. However, the successful negotiation of the ban treaty would be the first step only.

It is distressing that the ban treaty falls short of the ultimate goal. The current nuclear weapons arsenals will not be eliminated. And consequently, the nuclear dangers remain: the thousands of deployed nuclear weapons - with 800 on hair trigger-alert and targeted for immediate launch; cyber-attacks on nuclear command and control systems; the tinderbox tensions between India and Pakistan; North Korea’s determination to be a nuclear power; the deteriorating relations between Russia and NATO, between Russia and the U.S; the destruction by the new US Administration of the status quo of current international relations; and uncertainty of U.S. President’s intentions regarding nuclear issues.

The only solution for true guaranteed human security to prevent, what we know would be catastrophic consequences, is the total elimination and ban for all time of nuclear weapons.

It is imperative that the essential elements for nuclear security, missing from the Ban Treaty, be addressed immediately.

---

<sup>2</sup> United States Non-Paper *Defense Impacts of Potential United Nations General Assembly Nuclear Weapons Ban Treaty*, 2-1 October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2016:

<sup>3</sup>*Changing the Landscape: The U.N. Open-Ended Working Group on Nuclear Disarmament*, The Simons Foundation Briefing Paper, September 2016, [www.thesimonsfoundation.ca](http://www.thesimonsfoundation.ca). My emphasis.

*And I call on Canada to undertake this – to spearhead activity to propose a second complementary Treaty.* For Canada to promote Point 1 of Ban Ki Moon’s Five-Point proposal for nuclear disarmament for, either the negotiation of a “Nuclear Weapons Convention backed by a strong system of verification” and transparency measures, or for the nuclear weapons states to forge “agreement on a framework of separate, mutually reinforcing instruments.”

Nuclear disarmament cannot - and will not - move forward without the participation of the states with the weapons. Yet, the ban will make it impossible for the US and NATO to continue with the current nuclear war planning and related practices.

Because of the U.S.’s failure to stop the ban, it is crucial that Canada, NATO and Asia-Pacific allies turn the tables on the United States - with its Non-Paper - and strongly encourage the United States and the other nuclear weapons states to support either a Nuclear Weapons Convention; or to encourage them to engage in a framework agreement to safely and securely eliminate their arsenals – that is, to encourage the United States and Russia to return to their programme of bi-lateral reductions, to bring the weapons down to par with the other nuclear weapons states in order to engage in multilateral negotiations to eliminate to zero within a time-bound framework.

Global Zero’s Action Plan is compatible with Point 1 of UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon’s Five-Point plan for nuclear disarmament. It is a practical four-phase blueprint of concrete steps, which includes a negotiated and signed legally binding international agreement for verified dismantlement of all nuclear arsenals and the elimination of all nuclear weapons by 2030.<sup>4</sup>The Global Zero Action Plan could serve as a foundation for the framework process.

---

<sup>4</sup> Phases 1 and 2 of the Action Plan call for bilateral action on the part of the US and Russia – to agree to each reduce their arsenals to 1,000 by 2018 and to further reductions to 500 warheads each by 2021. The U.S. and Russia would ratify a bi-lateral accord and require the other nuclear weapons states to commit to a cap on their existing stockpiles and to participate in multilateral negotiations for proportionate reductions of their stockpiles following the Russian and US reductions to 500 each until 2021.

The Action Plan requires “a rigorous and comprehensive verification and enforcement system is implemented, including no-notice, on-site inspections, and strengthened safeguards on the civilian nuclear fuel cycle to prevent diversion of materials to build weapons.”

Phase 3 of Action Plan requires all “the world’s nuclear-capable countries negotiate and sign a Global Zero Accord: a legally binding international agreement for the phased, verified, proportionate reduction of all nuclear arsenals to zero total warheads by 2030. [compatible with UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon’s 5-point plan for nuclear disarmament]

And Phase 4 “The phased, verified, proportionate dismantlement of all nuclear arsenals to zero total warheads is complete by 2030. The comprehensive verification and enforcement system prohibiting the development and possession of nuclear weapons is in place to ensure that the world is never again threatened by nuclear weapons.

Meanwhile, advocacy to reduce the risks must continue, - and Canada can support this –

1) the promotion of No First Use as a global norm; 2) the de-alerting of nuclear weapons to reduce the risks of accidental or unauthorized use; 3) for the US and Russia to eliminate launch on warning from their operational strategy; 4) for US-Russia to return to the bi-lateral steps to reduce their arsenals further including and multi-lateral steps to stabilize the world's Nuclear Force Postures.

It is essential to move forward from the attempts to manage and control proliferation and to engage in effective development and enforcement of nuclear weapons elimination measures.

I call on the Government of Canada to step up its role in nuclear disarmament; to return to the active nuclear disarmament agenda of the previous Liberal government, in order to support humanity which is stake, and forced to live on the brink of catastrophe.

Thank you very much!