

53rd PUGWASH CONFERENCE
Halifax, Canada, 14-22 July 2003
ELIMINATING THE THREAT OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS¹
Plenary Session 4, 19 July 2003
Statement by Miguel Marin-Bosch

I am pleased to be at another Pugwash Conference. I have attended them sporadically for almost a quarter of a century. Now, as a member of the Pugwash Council, my attendance record is bound to improve.

Until recently I was Mexico's deputy foreign minister in charge of Africa, Asia-Pacific, Europe and the United Nations. But I quit because, among many other reasons, the foreign minister refused to do the right thing in the UN Security Council where we now sit. Last year's travesty concerning the International Criminal Court, which was repeated recently, was the last straw. Now I am at the Universidad Iberoamericana where I teach a course on disarmament and international security. It's better there than in the government.

Countries should strive to do the right thing in both their domestic and foreign affairs. This is especially true when others misbehave. If a country breaks international law and the others do nothing, then they are all part of the problem. If you refuse to support a draft resolution in the UN Security Council authorizing the use of force against Saddam Hussein and then say nothing once the invasion has taken place, then you are an accomplice. Not a single country did the right thing at the United Nations. Worse still, many then joined in the so-called reconstruction effort in Iraq and thus accepted the authority of the invading forces of the United States and the United Kingdom.

One must also do the right thing in disarmament matters. And here Pugwash has a role to play, as Joseph Rotblat eloquently reminded us last evening.

This panel has been asked to address a subject that is in a very sad state. So, I shall be brief and spare you the pain of sorrow-filled details.

In multilateral fora there is no discussion, let alone negotiations, on nuclear weapons. They are present on many bilateral agendas. Just open a newspaper. There one finds articles on the potential threat of Saddam Hussein's nuclear program . . . of a decade ago; on North Korea's nuclear aspirations; on Iran as a possible nuclear threat. But there is next to nothing on the real, existing arsenals of the eight nuclear-weapon states (NWS).

¹ Unpublished text.

There have been many attempts to begin a discussion of the threat of nuclear weapons with a view to their complete elimination. The Conference on Disarmament in Geneva comes to mind. Nuclear weapons are the first item of its agenda. Nothing doing there. In fact nothing has happened in the CD since the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) draft was taken off to the UN General Assembly in New York in the fall of 1996 without the expressed, written consent of all CD members.

Hop over to the UN itself. Nothing doing there either, except for the annual set of General Assembly resolutions that demonstrate that there are many countries which want to eliminate nuclear weapons and some which want to retain nuclear weapons, individually or by proxy.

In the Security Council there is much discussion on nuclear weapons except, of course, the nuclear arsenals of the five permanent members.

The 1996 International Court of Justice's advisory opinion was another attempt to push forward the discussion on nuclear weapons, but it has largely been ignored.

What about the UN Disarmament Commission? Nothing doing there either --it is allergic to any substantive discussions.

UNGA special sessions work for many subjects --children, women, development, etc.-- but since 1978 they have not worked for disarmament. The UN Secretary-General raised this possibility a few years ago but it met with the usual resistance from the usual suspects.

Then there are the NPT review conferences. But look at what was agreed to in 2000 and what has been done since then. Nothing. In fact, there has been much regression. This regression is due primarily, but not exclusively, to the United States' current position regarding nuclear weapons.

Why, one might ask, have nuclear weapons disappeared from the multilateral agenda? I can hear some say that they were never on that agenda. They will argue that the 1963 Partial Test Ban Treaty was negotiated by the three NWS then actively participating in the ENDC, the Geneva Conference on Disarmament's grandmother or, perhaps, great grandmother. They will say that the provisions of 1968 Non-proliferation Treaty speak clearly about stopping the *horizontal* proliferation of nuclear weapons but speak cryptically about *vertical* non-proliferation, i.e., nuclear disarmament. The aim of the NPT was to limit the number of nuclear players and it has had much success. Then there is the CTBT, which is nothing more than an

NPT in disguise. And, given its entry into force provisions, together with the current attitude of the United States, its future is bleak.

The danger of further horizontal nuclear proliferation is real. And yet the NWS refuse to sit down and begin a discussion on genuine nuclear disarmament. And, as Pugwash has stated repeatedly, the threat of further proliferation will continue as long as the NWS hold on to their own nuclear weapons. That is why all NWS, whether *de jure* or *de facto*, must sit down and agree on a path that will lead to a nuclear-weapon-free world.

Quite obviously, they will not do it on their own. Others must push them along. And here public opinion will play a major role. We must therefore find ways to raise the visibility of the threat posed by existing nuclear arsenals and further proliferation. That is part of the aim of the study on weapons of mass destruction to be undertaken under the auspices of the Swedish government. This should also be a major concern for action by Pugwash.

The reasons are many. For example, take the changing nuclear posture of the United States. Or take NATO expansion. Given NATO's nuclear stance, more and more countries are now accepting that nuclear weapons have a role, a legitimate one at that, in international relations.

I agree with those who have proposed to focus on the year 2005. It will mark the 60th anniversary of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the 50th of the Russell-Einstein Manifesto and the 10th of Joseph Rotblat's and Pugwash's Nobel Peace Prize.

We must find a handle, something that attracts and retains the public's attention. We must press the United States and other NWS, but we must also put pressure on so-called active countries, such as those that are part of the Middle Power Initiative or New Agenda. And, most of all, we should follow the recommendations of last year's UN study on disarmament education and educate, educate, educate.

And Pugwash should ensure that ethics remains at the center of the crusade against nuclear weapons. I say "crusade" because that is what it will take to rid the world of nuclear weapons. It took a crusade to end slavery in the 19th century and it took another crusade to end colonialism in the 20th century. Nukes are next.