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On November 20, 2007, Mr. Jonathan Granoff, President of the Global Security Institute (GSI) and Advisor to the Parliamentary Network on Nuclear Non Proliferation and Disarmament (PNND), presented the following remarks at the 2007 Parliamentary Meeting of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, which was cosponsored by the United Nations.

Mr. Granoff chaired the afternoon session entitled “Observing the rule of law in the implementation of key international commitments in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation”, held in the Economic and Social Council Chambers of the United Nations Secretariat in New York.

He was joined on the dais by noted diplomats, parliamentarians, and experts in non-proliferation and disarmament, including: H.E. Ms. Hannelore Hoppe, Officer-in-Charge, the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs; Senator Rosario Green Macias of Mexico; H.E. Mr. Peter Burian (Slovakia), Chairman of the United Nations Security Council 1540 Committee; and H.E. Mr. Tibor Toth, Executive Secretary of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization.

Speaking before the representatives of more than 70 parliaments from the Americas, Africa, Asia, Australia, the Middle East and Europe, and invited representatives of the United Nations, Mr. Granoff highlighted his vision of three interconnected issues that form the ‘axis of our collective responsibility’ – global poverty, the environment, and nuclear weapons.

After many years, two of these issues – poverty and the environment- are starting to gain the attention they deserve, and strong constituencies are being built to address these issues. Mr. Granoff spoke at length on the need to address all of these issues holistically, and that on the third axis – nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament – greater attention is needed to enforce existing commitments to future generations, and to the role of the rule of law in enforcing those commitments.

As Chair, Mr. Granoff moderated the robust dialogue between parliamentarians and presenters, which was marked by contributions from not only the non-nuclear weapons states but from nuclear weapons states as well. Contributions from both often centered on the practical steps that parliamentarians could take within their respective governments to advance the compass point of the elimination of nuclear weapons at a global level.

The dialogue was amplified by the presence of the Honorable Alexa McDonough of Canada, Co-President of the Parliamentary Network for Non-proliferation and Disarmament, who highlighted the positive impact that the Global Security Institute and PNND have in raising awareness and providing resources on practical steps that legislators can take to work across party and national boundaries on this critical issue.
The Mayor of Nagasaki pleads with us to understand the human dimensions of one relatively small atomic bomb:

*The explosion of the atomic bomb generated an enormous fireball, 200 meters in radius, almost as though a small sun had appeared in the sky. The next instant, a ferocious blast and wave of heat assailed the ground with a thunderous roar. The surface temperature of the fireball was about 7,000 degrees C, and the heat rays that reached the ground were over 3,000 degrees C. The explosion instantly killed or injured people within a two-kilometer radius of the hypocenter, leaving innumerable corpses charred like clumps of charcoal and scattered in the ruins near the hypocenter. In some cases, not even a trace of the person’s remains could be found. A wind (over 680 miles per hour) slapped down trees and demolished most buildings. Even iron-reinforced concrete structures were so badly damaged that they seemed to have been smashed by a giant hammer. The fierce flash of heat meanwhile melted glass and left metal objects contorted like strands of taffy, and the subsequent fires burned the ruins of the city to ashes. Nagasaki became a city of death where not even the sound of insects could be heard.*

*After a while, countless men, women and children began to gather for a drink of water at the banks of the nearby Urakami River, their hair and clothing scorched and their burnt skin hanging off in sheets like rags. Begging for help, they died one after another in the water or in heaps on the banks. Then radiation began to take its toll, killing people like a scourge (of) death expanding in concentric circles from the hypocenter. Four months after the atomic bombing, 74,000 people were dead and 75,000 had suffered injuries, that is, two thirds of the city population had fallen victim to this calamity that came upon Nagasaki like a preview of the Apocalypse.*

George Kennan, the distinguished American diplomat who originated the Cold War containment policy toward the Soviet Union, not associated with moral admonitions, warns us:

*The readiness to use nuclear weapons against other human beings – against people we do not know, whom we have never seen, and whose guilt or innocence is not for us to establish – and, in doing so, to place in jeopardy the natural structure upon which all civilization rests, as though the safety and perceived interests of our own generation were more important than everything that has taken place or could take place in civilization: this is nothing less than a*
presumption, a blasphemy, an indignity – an indignity of monstrous dimensions – offered to God!

General George Lee Butler, who as former Commander-in-Chief of U.S. Strategic Air Command (1991-92) and U.S. Strategic Command (1992-94) was responsible for all nuclear forces in the U.S. Air Force and Navy, stated forcefully:

“Despite all the evidence, we have yet to fully grasp the monstrous effect of these weapons, that the consequences of their use defy reason, transcending time and space, poisoning the Earth and deforming its inhabitants....Nuclear weapons are inherently dangerous, hugely expensive and militarily inefficient.”

Former US Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara in the May/June 2005 issue of Foreign Policy, wrote:

This in a nutshell is what nuclear weapons do: They indiscriminately blast, burn, and irradiate with a speed and finality that are almost incomprehensible. This is exactly what countries like the United States and Russia, with nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert, continue to threaten every minute of every day in this new 21st century.

I have worked on issues relating to U.S. and NATO nuclear strategy and war plans for more than 40 years. During that time, I have never seen a piece of paper that outlined a plan for the United States or NATO to initiate the use of nuclear weapons with any benefit for the United States or NATO. I have made this statement in front of audiences, including NATO defense ministers and senior military leaders, many times. No one has ever refuted it. To launch weapons against a nuclear-equipped opponent would be suicidal. To do so against a nonnuclear enemy would be militarily unnecessary, morally repugnant, and politically indefensible.

The fact that more than a decade after the end of the Cold War there are more than 25,000 nuclear weapons, with the US and Russia still squaring off with over 96% of the arsenals and thousands still on launch on warning hair trigger alert, should cause any prudent person alarm. The wake up call is being heard on protecting the environment since climate change cannot be ignored and the Millennium Development Goals ring a hopeful note that poverty in our lifetime could become history. My belief is that without progress in the arena of cooperative security these other critical challenges will remain unmet and our collective future uncertain. For that reason I urge you to reflect deeply on the Axis of Responsibility.
Responsibility for Our Common Future

The world is interconnected as never before. It is not only connected presently but decisions made today will have permanent consequences long into the future. If our decisions today are flawed we cannot say how long the future will last. This is unique in human history. We are the first generation which on several issues must ensure consciously and intentionally that we are not the last.

Moreover, our most critical challenges require new levels of holistic creative thinking and governance that can integrate local concerns with global responsibility. The dangers that used to hang over only a few now hang over the heads of all. Wisdom to understand the interconnectedness of the dangers is now also required. No longer can we afford to think locally and act globally. Humanity’s global footprint must be met with appropriate thinking and policies.

There is an Axis of Responsibility. Three issues require global cooperation, the rule of law, and universal norms. Whether we effectively address crushing poverty, adequately organize ourselves to protect the global commons such as the oceans, the climate, and the rainforest—living systems upon which civilization depends—and eliminate nuclear weapons before they eliminate us, defines whether we pass on a sustainable future.

No state, nor even a powerful group of states, can succeed alone. Universal coordinated approaches using our highest values and the arts of law and diplomacy are needed.

Members of parliaments, as never before, simply must educate the public that apathy is not acceptable. Publics will not empower leaders with the political room to create necessary changes unless they are made aware. All too often the media exploits the pornography of the trivial. We simply cannot allow this hurdle to constrain what we know to be critical – creating the political passion and will to act now. We have a duty to constrain greed and the pursuit of power with law, morality and reason. If fear continues to guide us, these tools will continue to fail us. Leaders such as yourselves can bring hope but only when vision and analysis are clear. To do so, you simply must make these global concerns part of your domestic and local agendas.

Priorities must be recalibrated; our collective survival is at stake. This will cost money everywhere, enormous economic adjustments, and changes in values and lifestyles.

We know short term economic opportunities might have to give way to long term environmental responsibility. At the outset, let me thus place before your minds a question to hold as I set forth the nodes of the Axis of Responsibility: Will we achieve the necessary cooperation in a world with nuclear weapons in the hands of a few who claim the privilege of superior security interests?

Protecting Global Commons

No nation can be secure when the living systems upon which everyone depends are at risk. Global warming will lead to radical changes in food production and increase the likelihood of disease pandemics. Climate change will cause population displacements
leading to instability and conflict. Rainforest destruction -- whether in Brazil, Canada, or anywhere—destroys the lungs of the planet and thus the air we all need to breathe. If one country can dump in the oceans, all can dump toxic chemicals and life destroying waste through that country’s flag. We must protect the oceans biodiversity and fishing stocks. This issue is gaining public traction but cannot be addressed in isolation. Is there anyone so naive as to think that global warming will exempt any country from its destructive forces? In this regard, we recommend the following immediate steps:

1. Create an International Environmental Protection Agency
2. Create an International Sustainable Energy Agency to advance non fossil fuel, safe, clean, renewable energy resources
4. Complete negotiations for a strengthened follow up to the Kyoto Protocols

**Poverty and Sustainable Development**

Can we survive a world where vast millions lack a simple glass of clean water? A world where half of the population lives on less than $2.00 per day cannot be sustained. It is both immoral and impractical to ignore such suffering when we know there are solutions achievable at low cost. The Marshall Plan worked well, helping to build a post WWII security system with trading partners. The same principles can now be applied between the developed and developing communities. The Millennium Development Goals and the plans developed at the World Summit on Social Development set forth excellent maps. Crushing poverty is an injustice that breeds the instabilities and suffering wherein hopelessness turns to terrorism. Immigration becomes a problem because people cannot sustain their families by staying home. The world is now our collective home. We have to make every room in the home hospitable. And again there is traction and public awareness to pursue a sustainable development agenda.

In this regard, we recommend the following immediate steps:

1. Fulfill the Millennium Development Goals
2. Convene a Global Marshall Plan Summit
3. Review and Reform Agricultural Subsidy Policies of Developed Nations
4. Declare that there is a Human Right to Water
5. Advance access to micro-credit
Nuclear Disarmament

On this issue, we are in a unique deadlock. The enormity of the crisis is being overlooked. The core bargain of the NPT is threatened by the ad hoc approach of the most powerful who would sacrifice the core bargain of the non-proliferation regime of only rewarding those who eschew proliferation while seeking to constrain those who would proliferate. The fact that members of the Nuclear Suppliers Group which has nearly all its members as supporters of a FMCT with verification and a nuclear test ban failing to affirmatively attach such stipulations to a nuclear sharing deal with India is irresponsible, no, it is appalling. The fact that so little pressure is being placed on Russia and the US to change the operational status, no, the entire status of their bloated arsenals is inexcusable. The fact that parliaments are not demanding disarmament progress is simply intolerable.

People of the world when polled overwhelmingly express the insight that nuclear weapons are more of a problem than any problem they seek to solve. Members of this body have passed strong non-proliferation resolutions, but until there is a clarion call for abolition, rendering the nuclear weapon as unacceptable as the plague as a weapon, the conscience of humanity will be marginalized. This is a deficit of values in public policy. And members of parliaments must address this democracy deficit. But parliaments remain docile and fenced in by provincial local issues. We must speak up. Your leadership is critical as never before.

We all know that security in all its aspects must be redefined as integrated and based on cooperation, engagement, law, and shared interests. Preventing weaponization of space thus remains a high priority, since disarmament on earth will be the first victim of a weapons race in space. Simply, we cannot sustain a world where the security for some is valued more than for others. But the greatest present disequilibrium in the quest for common security is the fact of nuclear weapons apartheid. It is a central litmus test of our time – to succeed we must change a variety of relationships and to fail on this issue is not acceptable. Nuclear weapons are unworthy of civilization and the only security against their spread and use is their universal, legally verifiable elimination.

Every step towards the elimination of nuclear weapons must reduce threats, enhance security, and promote the rule of law. Nuclear weapons themselves are unacceptably dangerous in anyone’s hands. Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev knew ever so clearly how nuclear weapons threaten civilization. The threat has not disappeared. President Reagan called for the abolition of “all nuclear weapons” which he considered to be “totally irrational, totally inhumane, good for nothing but killing, possibly destructive of life on Earth and civilization”. His call has recently been echoed by Henry Kissinger, George Schultz, William Perry and Sam Nunn in a January 7, 2007 Wall Street Journal oped. They correctly argue that we do not live in a static world. Their call for progress based purely on political realism was amplified by President Mikhael Gorbachev’s response of in the Wall Street Journal on January 31, 2007:

“We must put the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons back on the agenda, not in a distant future but as soon as possible. It links the moral imperative—the rejection of such weapons from an ethical standpoint—with the imperative of assuring security. It is
becoming clearer that nuclear weapons are no longer a means of achieving security; in fact, with every passing year, they make our security more precarious.”

Without clear commitment to the vision of disarmament, and a passion to achieve it, the inequities of the current order cannot be self sustaining. Our choice is a sustainable non-proliferation regime with movement toward disarmament, or a denial of the inequities and ever more dangerous counter proliferation adventures, like Iraq. We cannot think the status quo will hold. We must either accept ever more violent counter proliferation efforts or get on with nuclear disarmament. There is insufficient public traction on this axis. The other two in fact depend upon this issue. Yet, we cannot achieve a nuclear weapons free world overnight, but we can diminish risks and begin the journey today.

In this regard, we recommend the following immediate steps:

1. Reaffirm the commitment to nuclear disarmament embodied in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and expressed in its review conferences of 1995 and 2000

2. Take practical steps that demonstrate that commitment, including, banning further testing of nuclear weapons anywhere in the world forever, ending through verifiable means any further production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons, taking all nuclear missiles everywhere off hair trigger launch on warning alert, pledging never to use a nuclear weapon first, and verifiable reductions leading to the total universal elimination of these horrific devices

3. Ensure by legally binding instruments that no cities can be targeted with nuclear weapons nor nuclear weapons deployed in or near cities.

To achieve these goals members of parliaments have both the capacity and duty to band together. Here are some suggestions that could be done soon:

1) Inter-parliamentary Exchanges

One step that could be taken very quickly would be to prevent the next counter proliferation war by advancing increased understanding with Iran by instituting massive inter parliamentary exchanges. President Ahmadenijad of Iran said he would encourage such efforts when he was in the New York City this past September. Senator Chuck Hagel, Republican from Nebraska, recently extolled the virtues of such efforts. I urge progress on this humanizing path.

2) Creation of an IPU Standing Committee on Non-proliferation and Disarmament

There is already a Committee on Peace and Security in the IPU, but nuclear weapons remain a unique, central inadequately addressed lacuna in international affairs. Yes, sentiments are expressed in the resolutions of the General Assembly, the World Court issued a strong advisory opinion and the NPT calls for disarmament, but unless public support is stimulated and legislators the world over put pressure on the nuclear weapons states real progress will evade us. By pressure, let me cite resolutions calling for removal of nuclear weapons onto domestic soil, thus ending NATO forward deployments, legacies of the Cold War, or, as in Norway, where government
controlled pension funds have taken steps to divest large sums in companies engaged in nuclear weapons. Simply, there are many creative steps that could be taken.

A structure to energetically address the issue within IPU is needed. The Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament, the Global Security Institute’s program with over 700 members in over 50 countries, could partner with a new standing committee of this body on nuclear disarmament.

I urge the creation of a Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament Standing Committee.

3) Advance Cooperative Security in Space

I would also urge you to encourage the Secretary General to follow the advice of his Advisory Board on Disarmament and create a high level panel to address cooperative security in space. We simply cannot allow weaponization of space to hold the earth hostage to a flawed model of cooperation and security.

Conclusion

We must help generate the will to create new initiatives, for the only “coalition of the willing” that can successfully address the problems identified as the axis of responsibility is a global coalition consisting of all states -- global problems require global solutions, not clubs or vigilante groups. There could scarcely be a more formidable “coalition of the willing” for disarmament, development and the environment than one consisting of the UN and the national parliaments, united in a common cause.

As members of the human family fully aware of the fact that today’s choices will dramatically affect those yet to come, as well as those suffering today, we thus ask ourselves three powerful questions. We have suggested steps to answer them, but realize that others may have better approaches. But having no coherent approach spells irresponsibility. Let me end with one more suggestion. In political campaigns the world over, questions must be asked of every political leader and candidate:

1) What are your plans to address crushing poverty and ensure sustainable livelihoods and productive, just employment?

2) What are your plans to protect the global commons such as the oceans, the climate, and the rainforests—the living systems upon which all civilization depends?

3) What are your plans to eliminate the threat of nuclear weapons?

If we answer these questions correctly, our responsibilities to generations to come will be fulfilled.
**Jonathan Granoff**, President of the Global Security Institute, is also Co-Chair of the Blue Ribbon Task Force on Nuclear Nonproliferation and Senior Advisor to the National Security Committee of the International Law Section of the American Bar Association. He serves on numerous governing and advisory boards including the Global Dialogue Institute, Middle Powers Initiative, Jane Goodall Institute, the Parliamentary Network for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament and the Bipartisan Security Group.

Mr. Granoff is both a Member of the World Wisdom Council and a Fellow of the World Academy of Arts and Sciences, and has represented the International Peace Bureau at the Nobel Peace Laureate Summits in Rome every year since 2002.

Jonathan Granoff has lectured worldwide emphasizing the legal, ethical and spiritual dimensions of human development and security, with a specific focus on the threats posed by nuclear weapons. He is an award-winning screenwriter, and has been featured in more than 30 publications.

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.

Parliamentarians for Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament (PNND) is a global network of over 500 parliamentarians from more than 70 countries working to prevent nuclear proliferation and achieve nuclear disarmament. Membership is open to current members of legislatures and parliaments at state, federal, national and regional levels.