

## The Road Ahead

Ambassador Thomas Graham, Jr.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

October 22, 2008

Today we find ourselves in the midst of many crises. The one most before us, and rightly so, is the economic crisis. While this highly serious situation has the capability of affecting our standard of living and financial security in a profound way, it also has a national security component as well. As Senator Obama said during the debate last week, no great nation in the past has suffered significant economic reverse and been able to retain its military preeminence. But as important as this crisis is we must not forget the many other threats that face us. Senator McCain said a few years ago that our world image is “an an all time low” and it still is. This is not unimportant in that it means that it is much more difficult to persuade other nations to cooperate with us in solving the serious international security problems that exist.

The Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is the centerpiece of world security. But its success is no accident. The treaty is rooted in a carefully crafted central bargain. In exchange for a commitment from the non-nuclear weapon states (today more than 180 nations, most of the world) not to acquire nuclear weapons and to submit to international safeguards to verify compliance with this commitment, the NPT nuclear weapon states pledged unfettered access to peaceful nuclear technologies and undertook to engage in nuclear disarmament negotiations aimed at the ultimate elimination of their nuclear arsenals. It is this basic bargain that for the last three decades has formed the central underpinnings of the international nonproliferation regime.

President John F. Kennedy truly believed that nuclear weapons might sweep all over the world, there were predictions during his administration that by the end of the 1970's there would be 15-20 nuclear weapon states in the world with nuclear weapons fully integrated their national arsenals. If this had happened there would be <sup>far</sup> more nuclear weapon states today. Mohamed El Baredai, the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, in 2004 said that more than 40 states <sup>now</sup> have the capability to build nuclear weapons. With so many nuclear weapon states in the world, nuclear weapons would be so widespread, that every conflict would carry the risk of going nuclear and it would be enormously difficult to keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of terrorist organizations. But such proliferation did not happen and the principal reason that it did not was the entry into force of the NPT in 1970, along with the associated nuclear umbrella policies of the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War. Contrary to the predictions, only two additional countries have acquired nuclear weapons since 1970, far from the fears of President Kennedy. There are five nuclear weapon states recognized by the NPT: the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia and China. In addition, two states in 1970 either already had, or were very close to, a nuclear weapon capability, India and Israel. Beyond this, only Pakistan and North Korea have acquired nuclear weapons since 1970. Thus far, the NPT has been a considerable success.

However, one of the major difficulties <sup>is</sup> with achieving a truly effective NPT regime has been that the nuclear weapon states have never really delivered on the disarmament part of the NPT central bargain and in recent years it appears to have been largely abandoned. The essence of the disarmament commitment was that pending the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons arsenal the nuclear weapon states would: agree to a treaty prohibiting all nuclear weapon tests, that is a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty or CTBT; negotiate an agreement prohibiting the further production of nuclear bomb explosive material known as a fissile material cut off treaty, or FMCT; undertake obligations to drastically reduce their nuclear weapon arsenals; and give legally binding commitments that they would never use nuclear weapons against NPT non-nuclear weapons state. Almost none of this has been accomplished over 35 <sup>any</sup>

years later. The CTBT was negotiated and signed in 1996 but the US senate rejected it in 1999. There have been no negotiated real reductions of nuclear weapons since 1994; there has never been any progress toward an agreement prohibiting the further production of fissile material for weapons; and even though political commitments were made by the NPT nuclear weapon states in 1995 in effect not to use nuclear weapons against their NPT non-nuclear weapon treaty partners, the national policies of the United States, Great Britain, France and Russia are the opposite—holding open this option.

And now the other side of the bargain has begun to fall apart. India and Pakistan eroded the NPT from the outside by each conducting a series of nuclear weapon tests in 1998 and declaring themselves to be nuclear weapon states. India, Pakistan and Israel maintain sizable unregulated nuclear weapon arsenals outside the NPT. North Korea withdrew from the NPT in 2003, may have built up to eight to ten nuclear weapons and has conducted a nuclear weapon test. The DPRK has agreed in principle to return to the NPT and negotiate an end to its nuclear weapon program and significant progress has been made toward this objective, but probably the actual elimination of their weapons is years away. The A.Q. Khan secret illegal nuclear weapon technology transferring ring based in Pakistan has been exposed but who can be sure that we have seen more than the tip of the ice berg? Iran is suspected of having a nuclear weapon program and has admitted that contrary to their IAEA Safeguards Agreement it failed to report its acquisition of uranium enrichment technology (from A.Q. Khan).

Some serious experts believe that the world soon could be faced with a new wave of nuclear weapon proliferation far beyond the current members of the nuclear club, more in the range of the nightmare vision of President Kennedy. But if it is indeed true that the world is on the brink of a surge in nuclear weapon proliferation, it can only be stopped by a coordinated effort by the United States and Russia who possess of 95 percent of the nuclear weapons in the world today. But does anyone believe that this is possible? I carry no brief for the Putin government in Russia but let us look at the record , Vladimir Putin was the first world leader to call President Bush after 9/11 and against the advice of his military he agreed to open Russia's Central Asian bases- on a temporary basis- to US forces. He also supported the

northern alliance in Afghanistan logistically so that it would be better prepared for the assault on Kabul that was to follow shortly.

And what was Putin's reward for this assistance? The United States withdrew from the ABM Treaty over the strong objections of Moscow. The United States announced that it planned to remain permanently in the Central Asian bases. To Putin's disappointment the United States refused to make the 2002 strategic arms arrangement anything more than a letter agreement when Putin wanted a full blown treaty. The three Baltic states, largely under the control of Moscow for hundreds of years, were absorbed into NATO. And there was the invasion of Iraq.

And more recently there has been the case of Georgia. The columnist Tom Freidman had it about right. He said if the war in Georgia was the Olympics, he would award the medals as follows: the gold medal to Putin for brutality, the silver medal to Saakashvili, the President of Georgia, for recklessness, and the bronze medal to the Clinton and Bush administrations for misguided behavior. This past summer Georgia peacekeepers attacked Russian peacekeepers in South Ossetia, a de facto independent enclave, with infantry and artillery, killing twelve Russians. Russia retaliated –undoubtedly long spoiling for this fight- with overwhelming force, essentially destroying the Georgian army and thereafter only grudgingly withdrawing from Georgia proper.

Our sympathies are with the Georgian people. On the other hand consistent NATO expansion over the last decade has backed Russia into a corner. One must look first at the interests of the United States in all of this, only thereafter looking at the interest of other countries. Russia is the only country in the world that could- if it chose national suicide- destroy the United States with its nuclear weapons. Without the cooperation of Russia, a potential new wave of proliferation could sweep over the world bringing the frightening security conditions previously mentioned. Without the help of Russia it will not be possible to restrain the nuclear weapon ambitions of Iran. Any thought that it will possible to continue pressuring Russia into greater isolation and at the same time gain Russia's cooperation in restraining

Iran's nuclear ambitions and more generally stopping nuclear weapon proliferation throughout the world is indulging in pipe dreams.

We have to ask ourselves what is more important to the United States interests, achieve membership in NATO for Georgia, as well as Ukraine, as has been proposed, or stopping nuclear weapons from spreading all over the world and constraining the Iranian nuclear weapon program.

The United States must find a way to have peace with Russia if international security is to be placed on a sound footing. However, beyond this the United States truly must lead in the world if the world community is to find peace and stability. As a former Senior Canadian Official put it to me the other day, "the only thing worse than American world leadership, is the lack of it." But can the United States, working with its allies and friends, return to its historic destiny of keeping the peace and fostering the development of the community of nations, democracies, free market economies, the international rule of law, international institutions and treaty arrangements?

To accomplish this America must, among other things, recognize that in the wake of the Cold War the world has fundamentally changed, the nation state system that has dominated international life for the last 350 years is rapidly deteriorating. Perhaps some 50-70 nations around the world are inexorably slipping into the category of failed states. The United States cannot do it alone. Since the end of the Cold War there has been roughly one major nation building intervention every two years. Poverty, disease, cultural misunderstanding and machine gun societies around the world are central national security threats; these are the principal causes of international terrorism and the primary weapons in the battle against terror and declining world order are economic, political, social, cultural, and diplomatic, and only rarely military. Reconstruction in failed states is one thing. It is relatively well understood but in many cases development, of necessity involving institution building, is essential to return failed states to a level where they can function. But to quote the well-known historian Francis Fukayama "any honest appraisal of where the 'state of the art' lies in development today would have to conclude that although

institutions may be important we know relatively little about how to create them.” But one thing that we do know Dr. Fukayama says is that “Coalitions, in the form of support from a wide range of other countries and international organizations... are important for a number of reasons.”

And further it should be noted that for over fifty years the United States pursued a world order built on rules and international treaties that permitted the expansion of democracy and enlargement of international security. Over three years ago in a speech before the American Society of International Law the Secretary of State said that when the United States respects its “international legal obligations and supports an international system based on the rule of law, we do the work of making this world a better place, but also a safe and more secure place for America.” The United States should join its allies and friends and ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, join the Ottawa Land Mine Convention, become part of the International Criminal Court and establish itself one again as a leading advocate of the international rule of law.

The United States and the world community, together, can and must take the urgent steps together toward controlling nuclear weapon proliferation and pursuing the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons as has been advocated in the past by Presidents Reagan and Gorbachev and is now being pursued by a broad coalition of leaders and experts led by George Schultz, William Perry, Sam Nunn, and Henry Kissinger, and provide for the safety of us all in a stable, secure and just Twenty-first Century.