

THE PONTIFICAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES



WORKSHOP ON

Less Nuclear Stocks and More Development



10 NOVEMBER 2014 • CASINA PIO IV • VATICAN CITY

Introduction

The existence of nuclear weapons poses serious security and safety threats to the countries possessing them and to the whole world. More than 20 years after the end of the cold war and the arms race, including in the nuclear field, it is time to have a comprehensive approach to national and international security architecture. Without such efforts the risk of a nuclear war, either by accident or by design, continues to be realistic, and even growing with new emerging nuclear powers, regionally and globally, and proliferation would be a consequence of not proceeding to concrete and effective nuclear disarmament aiming ultimately at the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

In the last few years military spending has been increasing and nuclear powers are modernizing or developing their stocks. At the same time, countries around the world are struggling to reduce poverty, to assure a better future to the young generation through education, professional training and decent jobs. The initiative would divert funding made available in national security budgets by such reductions for the alleviation of world poverty. It would thereby address the harm nuclear arms production does to the world's poor. The nuclear arms race is "an utterly treacherous trap for humanity and one which harms the poor to an intolerable degree" (*Gaudium et spes*, n. 81). Development, justice and respect for fundamental freedoms are the real foundation for national and international security.

In past decades we have witnessed some progress, unilaterally or bilaterally, in the area of nuclear stocks reduction. There is currently an impasse in efforts toward further agreed reductions. The continuing dangers of a nuclear weapons world cannot be ignored. Serious reductions in nuclear arsenals can be crafted and achieved and will help lessen the dangers. At the same time large amounts of funds will be saved that can be used for education, health and development in general.

To make this happen we need to build confidence between different actors and we have to address the security concerns of all. All contentious issues should be put on the table: missile defense, conventional prompt global strike, conventional arms race and imbalance, militarization and weaponization of outer space, etc. The different actors, in particular the super powers, have to move from a declaratory stand to a more concrete plan of action with clear objectives and an agreed timetable. In the meanwhile, the safety and security of the stocks of all possessors should remain of the utmost priority.

Reduction in nuclear warheads should be looked at in a comprehensive manner beyond the number of deployed warheads. It has to include, inter alia: non-deployed war heads, military doctrine, level of alert, modernization, etc.

The conversation between the 2 big nuclear powers and the reductions already made are positive and necessary steps but not sufficient. This effort should include the other nuclear powers. Otherwise the exercise will reach its limits at some point. The multilateral avenue is unavoidable if the main objective is a secure and stable world without nuclear weapons.

Any move, formal or informal, bilaterally or multilaterally, to focus the attention on the nuclear weapons issue would also re-raise international awareness of the need to reduce nuclear arms and the risks of nuclear conflicts, and to sharpen the focus on issues of world poverty. This move could have a stabilizing effect in contemporary centers of strife. It would also have a restraining impact on the temptation of aspiring nations to "go nuclear" by creating local incentives to meet the needs of the poor rather than spending huge sums on nuclear weapons. It would also set the stage for participation in joint efforts by all nuclear powers both in the diversion of freed-up resources and the elimination of their nuclear weapons and eventual associated reductions in conventional weapons.

The Holy See has spoken fervently since the beginning of the nuclear era on the need to prevent further use of nuclear weapons at all costs. Other religious leaders have done the same. It is important to continue to bring committed experts, religious representatives, international organizations, NGOs and States to have an open debate with a common objective which is to relieve humanity, now and in the future, from the threat of nuclear weapons.

This workshop highlights the issues, particularly the ethical and humanitarian dimensions, and involves experts from the Holy See and the Russian Orthodox Church. Experts from other countries (US, Russia, Italy, Norway, etc.) and institutions (UN, Global Priorities, etc.) have been invited to take part. No government representatives will be invited at this stage and no conclusions will be advanced except insofar as they identify issues that need resolution. All participants are invited in their own capacity. However, a key outcome of the Rome consultation might be that in this time of economic hardship and discord and cooling of relations between the nuclear superpowers, religious forces can exert considerable influence to identify and resolve pressing issues.

Programme

Opening	
08.30	Welcome and Introductory remarks: Bishop Marcelo Sánchez Sorondo, Chancellor of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences Introductory Remarks: Archbishop Silvano M. Tomasi, Permanent Observer to the United Nations Office and International Organizations in Geneva
Session I	
09.00	Major General William F. Burns (US Army, retired) <i>Nuclear Dangers in a Troubled World</i>
09.20	Comments by Dr. Maryanne Cusimano-Love, Catholic University of America
09.30	Discussion
10.30	Coffee Break
Session II	
11.00	Bishop Richard E. Pates, Bishop of Des Moines (USA), President of the Justice and Peace Commission of the US Bishops' Conference <i>Reductions versus Social Needs – The Rationale</i>
11.20	Comments by Pierre Morel, Former French Ambassador <i>Disarmament and Development: Approaches and Mechanisms?</i> Russian Orthodox Participant, Hieromonk Alexey Larionov Lawrence J. Korb Senior fellow, Center for American Progress, Washington, DC <i>Nuclear Budgets</i>
12.20	Discussion
13.00	Lunch
Session III	
14.30	Sverre Lodgaard, Former Director, UN Institute for Disarmament Research <i>Different Approaches (Step-by-Step, Building Blocks, Comprehensive) and Different Actors (Bilateral versus Multilateral)</i>
14.50	Comments by Ambassador Carlo Trezza
15.00	Discussion
15.30	Coffee Break

Session IV	
16.00	Rev. Drew Christiansen, S.J., Distinguished Professor of Ethics and Global Human Development, Georgetown University; former editor, America Magazine <i>Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons and Ethical Dimension of Deterrence</i>
16.20	<i>Comments by</i> Russian Orthodox Participant, Very Rev. Archpriest Vladimir Shmaliy
16.30	<i>Discussion</i>
Closing Session V	
16.40	Dr. Jeffrey Sachs, Economist, Director of the Earth Institute at Columbia University <i>Multilateral Nuclear Non-Disarmament as a Cause of Political, Social and Environmental Instability</i>
17.00	Patricia Lewis, Chatham House (UK) <i>Tentative Remarks on the Future of Nuclear Disarmament</i>
17.20	<i>Questions/Discussion/Closing/Final observations</i>
18.30	Archbishop Silvano M. Tomasi, Permanent Observer to the United Nations Office and International Organizations in Geneva <i>Closing Remarks</i> Bishop Marcelo Sánchez Sorondo, Chancellor of the Pontifical Academy of Sciences <i>Closing Remarks</i>
19.00	<i>Dinner</i>

List of Participants

TOMASI H.E. Msgr. Silvano

SÁNCHEZ SORONDO H.E. Msgr. Marcelo

ABI GHANEM Rev. Fr. Antoine

BURNS William F. General (USA)

CAUGHLEY Tim (Switzerland)

CHRISTIANSEN Rev. Fr. Drew (USA)

CONVERSI Paolo (Vatican City)

CUSIMANO-LOVE MaryAnn (USA)

DVORKIN General Vladimir (Russia)

HACKETT Kenneth F. (USA)

KOHEN Arnold (USA)

KORB Lawrence J. (USA)

LARIONOV Hieromonk Alexey (Russia)

LEWIS Patricia (UK)

LODGAARD Sverre (Norway)

MOREL Pierre (France)

PATES Richard E. (USA) Bishop

POWERS Gerard (USA)

SACHS Jeffrey (USA)

SHMALIY Very Rev. Archpriest Vladimir (Russia)

TREZZA Carlo Ambassador (Italy)

Final Statement

The long-standing hopes for a world without nuclear weapons merits our renewed efforts. These hopes are embodied in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and in the declarations of this Church and other groups around the world. We stand at the threshold of a new era of Sustainable Development, with new goals to end poverty, promote social inclusion, and protect the environment. Such hopes will be realized only in an era of true peace, and peace cannot be secure until the world moves to the elimination of nuclear weapons that threaten our very survival.

The geopolitical situation is complex, with great risks but also real possibilities for progress towards a world of zero nuclear weapons. The idea of complete denuclearization was once seen as the domain only of dreamers and idealists. Yet today it is the position of world-leading practitioners of international statecraft, including many current and former heads of state that participate in the Global Zero campaign. A series of US-Russian treaties, including the New Start Treaty, will soon reduce the stocks of the US and Russia to 1,550 deployed systems, marking dramatic reductions in nuclear stockpiles from the peak levels of both countries. Other nuclear powers, including the United Kingdom, France, and China, are also moving towards reductions of their own nuclear stockpiles.

On the other emerging global risks are equally dramatic, both regarding nuclear proliferation and geopolitical conditions more generally. Four nuclear powers are currently outside of the NPT framework entirely (Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Israel, and Pakistan) and many countries allege that Iran is also illegally pursuing a nuclear-weapons capacity contrary to its NPT responsibilities, a charge that Iran denies.

Perhaps just as dangerous, the geopolitical tensions involving the nuclear powers are rising, not diminishing. The US and European Union are in a tense confrontation with Russia over developments in the Ukraine, a confrontation so heated that a statesman no less than Mikhail Gorbachev has warned of a new Cold War. Tensions between Israel and its neighbors have worsened as well, especially following the recent Gaza War. The Middle East faces rising bloodshed and diplomatic confrontations in Lebanon, Iraq, Syria, and beyond. Iran and the Arab countries seem to be caught in an upward spiral of threats and recrimination, as well as proxy wars in Iraq and Syria. Tensions between India and Pakistan remain fraught, as do relations on the Korean Peninsula.

The challenges are further complicated by the inherent ambiguities and tensions that link nuclear arms and nuclear energy. On the one hand, the NPT envisions the availability of nuclear energy for every nation. The imperative of decarbonizing the world energy system in order to protect the global climate makes the deployment of nuclear energy more attractive for many countries, notably in Asia and the Middle East. Yet nuclear power opens more opportunities for secret arms programs, proliferation of fissile materials, and even the theft of such materials by terrorists.

In view of the highly complex interconnections among deterrence, proliferation, geopolitics, and peacetime nuclear energy needs, it is not surprising that the path to denuclearization currently seems blocked on many fronts. Regional and global tensions, hot wars involving the nuclear powers on one side or the other, and the heated arguments over potential military uses of peacetime nuclear power, all would seem to put deep denuclearization on the back burner or to render it impossible entirely. Yet these very

same tensions and ambiguities raise the global stakes for establishing a path and timetable to eliminate nuclear weapons even more essential.

In the encyclical *Pacem in Terris* a half-century ago, His Holiness Pope John XXIII made clear that the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons depends most fundamentally on a global interstate order founded on universal morality:

All must realize that there is no hope of putting an end to the building up of armaments, nor of reducing the present stocks, nor, still less—and this is the main point—of abolishing them altogether, unless the process is complete and thorough and unless it proceeds from inner conviction: unless, that is, everyone sincerely cooperated to banish the fear and anxious expectation of war with which men are oppressed. If this is to come about, the fundamental principle on which our present peace depends must be replaced by another, which declares that the true and solid peace of nations consists not in equality of arms but in mutual trust alone. We believe that this can be brought to pass, and we consider that, since it concerns a matter not only demanded by right reason but also eminently desirable in itself, it will prove to be the source of many benefits. (paragraph 113)

This puts before us the need to address not only the crucial issues of deterrence regimes, treaty design, and verification rules, all of which are critically important to be sure, but also to reinforce the moral framework of global politics itself. The new era of sustainable development can give us guidance and a measure of confidence as well.

The world faces unprecedented challenges of extreme poverty, social exclusion, and possible environmental catastrophe. To address these interconnected crises – economic, social, and environmental – the world community has adopted the concept of sustainable development as the organizing principle for the post-2015 global development. Moreover, the world community is on the verge of adopting three crucial agreements in 2015. In July 2015 (in Addis Ababa), the UN member states will agree on a new framework for Financing for Sustainable Development. In September 2015 (at the United Nations), the UN member states will adopt a set of Sustainable Development Goals to 2030, to help guide actions from the local to global scales. In December 2015 (in Paris), the UN member states will intend to adopt a new framework to limit human-induced climate change in order to avoid “dangerous interference in the climate system.”

The quest for zero nuclear arms can and should be reinforced in the context of sustainable development. Sustainable Development is about human survival and wellbeing, and nuclear disarmament is surely amongst the very highest priorities to secure that survival. The UN member states can therefore reinforce the priority of zero nuclear arms within the context of the new SDGs, which will include the goal of achieving “peaceful and inclusive societies” and “global partnerships for sustainable development.”

Denuclearization, and disarmament more generally, can deliver massive savings in budget outlays that may be urgently redirected towards economic and social objectives. Total military spending is currently around \$1.7 trillion per year, most of which is in the high-income countries. Even a ten-percent reduction of such spending would enable a doubling of global official development assistance that could be directed to universal health coverage, disease control, food

security, and access to safe water and sanitation. Isaiah's ancient command to beat swords to plowshares is now practicable and at hand, with "plowshare" institutions such as the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB, and Malaria able to translate increased funds directly into lives saved.

Yet none of this is possible in a world of growing tensions. The wars in Ukraine, Syria, Iraq, Libya, and beyond are not merely local tragedies, though they are certainly that. These wars are also catastrophic destroyers of global trust. They may lead non-nuclear countries to believe that nuclear weapons are key for the own survival; they may poison the atmosphere of trust needed for the US and Russia to cut nuclear weapons below the 1,550 target of the New Start Treaty; they may fracture the multilateral UN institutions vital for guiding any process towards the zero goal.

For this reason, we must also heed the wisdom of Pope John XXIII when he observed that the United Nations stands as a unique world authority to promote global peace and human dignity:

It is therefore our ardent desire that the United Nations Organization—in its structure and in its means—may become ever more equal to the magnitude and nobility of its tasks, and may the time come as quickly as possible when every human being will find therein an effective safeguard for the rights which derive directly from his dignity as a person, and which are therefore universal, inviolable and inalienable rights. (paragraph 145)

In our time, this means that the solutions to the crises in Syria, Iraq, Libya, Ukraine and other countries must not be supposed to lie not on the battlefield, but in the UN Security Council and in the political processes that the UN

alone can oversee with global legitimacy. Unless we adhere to the standards of international law in the governance of peace and the restraint of violence, that is, unless we adhere to the UN Charter and especially Chapter VII, our hopes and aspirations for sustainable development may come to naught.

In 1963, at the height of the Cold War, US President John F. Kennedy, and Soviet Chairman Nikita Khrushchev found their way to a first step towards peace, in the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. It was an accomplishment as unexpected as it was invaluable, in forging the way to the Non-Proliferation Treaty five years later, and therefore to the hopes for a world without nuclear weapons. They were inspired and guided in their quest by the message and prayers of Pope John XXIII and the lasting words of *Pacem in Terris*, which insisted on the moral code to guide international relations.

In the midst of that quest for peace, President Kennedy noted that as hard as it was to pursue peace, and much as it was viewed as "impossible" and "unreal," it was possible precisely because peace is a human right, and a shared objective of all human beings. We are wise to listen to JFK's famous words of hope on the possibility of achieving peace even with one's staunch adversaries. "Let us not be blind to our differences," said President Kennedy,

but let us also direct attention to our common interests and the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity. For in the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's futures. And we are all mortal.

Memorandum

1) A bus will depart from the Domus for the Academy 15 minutes before the beginning of the first Session (8.30 a.m.).


The same vehicle will take the participants back to the Domus after dinner.

2) Lunch and dinner will be served at the Academy.

3) Wifi is available in the Academy's Conference Hall. Please log in to the network called WLAN_PADS using "guest" as the username and "password" as the password.

4) Cable internet access is available at the Domus Sanctae Marthae for 7.50 Euros/per day.

Note. Please fill in your form for the refunding of expenses and give it to the Secretariat as soon as possible, before lunch time. Thank you.



THE PONTIFICAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES • CASINA PIO IV • V-00120 VATICAN CITY
 Tel: +39 0669883451 • Fax: +39 0669885218 • Email: pas@pas.va

For further information please visit:
www.pas.va