



SAM NUNN
CO-CHAIRMAN, NUCLEAR THREAT INITIATIVE
WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCIL OF WASHINGTON, D.C.
OCTOBER 22, 2002

Thank you, Frank Kramer, for your kind introduction and your outstanding leadership for our nation. As we meet here tonight, 14 months after 9/11, it is hard not to be reminded of the harsh reality of the world we live in. The events of last fall, including the devastating attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, and the dissemination of anthrax as a weapon, have made us all painfully aware of our vulnerability to terrorism. The headlines each day again remind us of our vulnerability here at home with the sniper attacks and danger abroad in the cases of Iraq and North Korea.

I am no longer in government, but I remain engaged in public policy. For many years I have believed that keeping weapons of mass destruction out of the hands of those who would not hesitate to use them to kill millions is our number one national security challenge. That is why I introduced the Nunn-Lugar legislation in 1991 and worked for its passage and its implementation with Senator Lugar and others. That is why I introduced the Nunn-Lugar-Domenici legislation in 1996 and worked for its passage and implementation with Senator Lugar and Senator Domenici and others. That is why I am now dedicating more than 50 percent of my time to work on preventing catastrophic terrorism with a foundation called the Nuclear Threat Initiative -- known as NTI -- which is inspired and funded by Ted Turner.

Amidst all of these headlines, three key challenges converge to pose a major security challenge to our nation and indeed to the world:

First, the persistent and growing gap between the developed and the developing world -- the haves and the have-nots -- continues to inflict humiliation, breed resentment and spark conflict in many parts of the world. The uneven integration of developing countries into the global economy, imbalances in population growth between rich and poor nations, severe environmental degradation, inadequate public health systems and a shortage of jobs and educational opportunities in the developing world all form a part of this disparity. There is some debate over whether the disparities are growing, shrinking or stable, but there can be no denying that in our globalized world, these disparities are easier to see and harder to accept and, therefore, breed greater resentment. The overlay of religious extremism greatly compounds this problem.

Second, a number of seemingly intractable conflicts continue to fester around the globe, inciting public outrage, a shared sense of humiliation, and even sympathy and support for terrorists in some quarters. Most notable among these are the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the dispute between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. Both of these ongoing conflicts have global impact and create deep grievances that terrorists are eager to exploit.

Third, nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, materials, and know-how are becoming more widely available to both rogue states and terrorists. Some people have called this the “democratization” of weapons of mass destruction. Ordinarily, we think of democratization as a good thing. Democratization in the area of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, however, means giving more people the power to find them, build them, and use them for destruction. Two examples before us today are Iraq and North Korea, each posing unique and dangerous challenges. There are many differences between the two, and the Bush Administration is correct, in my view, to proceed with these differences in mind, but the common denominator is the danger of nuclear development leading to nuclear use.

When we combine the growing availability of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, with the growing anger and hatred it would take to use them, we have a much higher probability of catastrophic terrorism -- with effects that would make the attacks of September 11th look like a warning shot.

THE GLOBAL THREAT

These dangers did not begin on September 11th -- indeed because of our response, they may have receded -- but the perception and apprehension of our citizens has grown enormously since September 11th, and regular security warnings add to this anxiety.

We must view September 11th as not just a terribly tragic warning shot, but a wake up call helping us realize that the terrorists' capacity for killing is limited only by the power of their weapons, and spurring us to take the right steps to defend ourselves, our country, and our future, including, importantly, dealing with underlying causes.

The greatest danger in the world today is the threat from nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. The likeliest use of these weapons is in terrorist hands.

We are in a new arms race between terrorist efforts to acquire nuclear, biological and chemical weapons and our efforts to stop them. To win the race, the United States needs a strategy to secure these weapons and materials quickly on a global basis.

This work has always been essential, but it is far from complete, and it has never been more urgent. We have moved into a new era of information and new technology, with great promise for humankind, but also with a dark side. The acceleration of scientific discovery, the ease of access to new technology, and the availability of nuclear, biological and chemical materials means it now takes fewer and fewer people to cause greater and greater devastation.

I've often been asked: “How difficult would it be for terrorists to detonate a nuclear weapon?” My answer is: “That depends on how difficult we make it.” If you analyze the terrorist path to a nuclear attack, it becomes clear that the most effective, least expensive way to prevent nuclear terrorism is to keep terrorists from getting nuclear weapons or the materials to make them in the first place. Acquiring weapons and materials is the hardest step for the terrorists to take, and the easiest step for us to stop. By contrast, each subsequent step in the process – building, transporting, and detonating a bomb – is easier for the terrorists to take and harder for us to stop.

That is why homeland security here in America, and every nation, must begin with securing weapons and materials at the source – in every country and every facility that has them.

Russia is home to mountains of nuclear bomb-making material. Less than half of it is adequately safeguarded. In the last ten years, roughly 6,000 nuclear warheads have been removed from deployment; more than 400 missile silos have been destroyed; and almost 1,400 ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, submarines and strategic bombers have been eliminated. The transportation of nuclear weapons has been made more secure, and storage of these weapons is gradually being upgraded at some sites. On the human side of the equation, almost 40,000 weapons scientists in Russia and other nations formed from the Soviet breakup have been provided support to pursue peaceful research or commercial projects.

A recent report from the Russian American Nuclear Security Advisory Council stated:

“These cooperative programs also have created an important new thread in the fabric of U.S.-Russian relations, one that has proven to be quite important during times of tension. Indeed, the sheer magnitude of the cooperative effort and the constant interaction among U.S. and Russian officials, military officers, and scientists has created a relationship of trust not thought possible during the Cold War. These relations are an intangible benefit that is hard to quantify in official reports, but they are a unique result of this work.

“However, the news in threat reduction is not all good. Progress on this essential agenda has been lagging in key areas, and in some projects, work is at a virtual standstill. Cooperation under the Cooperative Threat Reduction program was virtually suspended this spring and summer over a dispute concerning Russia’s chemical and biological weapons declarations.”

In my view, those in the U.S. Congress and the Russian bureaucracy who are holding up progress on these programs must be held accountable by the media and the public in both countries.

Working with Russia at our current pace, we will not secure all of its nuclear materials for years to come. This is the raw material of nuclear terrorism -- some of it secured by nothing more than an underpaid guard sitting inside a chain-link fence. In addition, the massive biological weapons program of the former Soviet Union developed many strains of anthrax, plague, and smallpox. A chemical weapons facility in Russia still houses nearly two million rounds of chemical nerve agents, enough to kill everyone on earth dozens of times. Russia knows it needs to destroy these weapons. They have asked for the world’s help. It has been very slow in coming. Outside Russia, the work to secure weapons and materials has barely begun. This is a crisis that demands an urgent global response.

THE GLOBAL RESPONSE

All countries with dangerous materials need to make this issue their highest national and global security priority -- to identify and initiate work on the most urgent projects, and to dramatically

increase funding to reflect the relative risk that nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons present to the health, welfare, economy and security of every nation in the world. That is why Senator Lugar and I are calling for a Global Coalition Against Catastrophic Terrorism, led by the United States and Russia. The U.S. and Russia were the key competitors in the arms race. The deadly residue of that race endangers global security. These two countries have an obligation to lead the world in undoing the danger. Other nations must also join and lead. To iterate just a few of the urgent tasks:

- Our number one priority must be to secure all nuclear, biological and chemical weapons and materials everywhere they exist in the world.
- Together, we must also reduce the number of U.S. and Russian tactical nuclear weapons, and secure and account for any that remain.
- Together, we must build a firebreak against any launch of nuclear weapons by accident or miscalculation by taking as many nuclear weapons as possible off hair-trigger alert in the U.S. and Russia.
- Together, we must greatly strengthen global public health systems, as well as undertake an Apollo-scale research program into vaccines, treatments, and the science of biology, so that we can immediately respond to infectious disease epidemics whether naturally occurring or from biological terrorism.
- Together, we must establish global norms and standards for the handling and scientific use of dangerous biological pathogens to prevent these materials from being used by terrorists.
- Together, we must complete the destruction of U.S. and Russian chemical weapons, which together account for over 90 percent of all chemical weapons in the world.

Keeping weapons of mass destruction out of terrorists' hands is either a priority or an afterthought. If it's a priority, we must prove it by our actions. If it's an afterthought, after what?

On the biological front, we must recognize that in the event of a biological weapons attack, millions of lives may depend on how quickly we can diagnose the effects, report the findings, disseminate information to the health care community, and bring forth a fast and effective response -- at both the local and federal level. This means that public health and medical professionals must be part of our national security team.

We also must develop, thoughtfully but quickly, simple instructions for our citizens to follow in the event of a biological attack. They must be accompanied by an educational campaign to build confidence in our people that government has thought about this in periods of calm and should be listened to in a crisis.

The good news from the biological terrorism front is that in our global society, most things we now must do because of the threat of biological terrorism will also help us prevent and respond to infectious diseases, which now take the lives of millions of people per year around the world.

NTI

Let me close with a few words on the foundation that I co-chair with Ted Turner. Thanks to Ted's vision and generosity, I've had the opportunity to remain engaged on these issues in the private sector through my work as co-chairman of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, which was launched in January of 2001.

NTI is working to help fill the gap between the threats from nuclear, biological and chemical weapons and the global response. Since governments have most of the resources and authority in the large-scale work of threat reduction, it is not only what NTI can do to directly reduce these threats that matters; it is also what NTI can persuade others to do.

NTI brings together people with different ideological views around a common ground mission focused on immediate action. NTI is governed by an international Board of Directors that includes two sitting U.S. Senators, two members of the Russian Duma, one member of the House of Lords, the former commander of U.S. strategic nuclear forces, a Nobel prize winning economist, and a former U.S. Secretary of Defense. We have Board members from the U.S., England, Sweden, Russia, India, Pakistan, Jordan, Japan and China.

Through my work at NTI, I'm often asked, "What are the odds of nuclear use by a terrorist group?" Today, I received a letter from Warren Buffett, who is an adviser to NTI, describing the statistical chance of a nuclear, biological or chemical weapon attack in the United States. His letter said:

"If the chance of a weapon of mass destruction being used in a given year is 10 percent and the same probability persists for 50 years, the probability of the event happening at least once during that 50 years is 99.5 percent. Thus, the chance of getting through the 50-year period without a disaster is .51 percent -- just slightly better than one in 200.

"If the probability of similar weapons being utilized can be reduced to 3 percent per year, the world has a 21.8 percent chance of making it through 50 years without an event. And if the annual chance can be reduced to 1 percent, there is a 60.5 percent chance of making it through 50 years.

"Of course, no one knows what the true probabilities are, but this sort of calculation points up the extraordinary benefit to humanity that can be achieved by reducing the probabilities of usage."

At NTI, we are working to reduce **toward zero** the risk that nuclear, biological or chemical weapons will ever be used, by intent or accident, anywhere in the world. This must become the mission of our government and others.

Let me briefly describe tonight some of our work that's designed to help fill the gaps and to stimulate governments to do much more -- not just the United States government, but governments around the world.

1. Project Vinca: Knowing of NTI's expressed concerns about unsecured highly enriched uranium from Soviet-era research reactors, the U.S. State Department approached NTI last year to support a U.S. government-funded project to remove two and a half bombs worth of vulnerable highly enriched uranium from a research reactor near Belgrade. NTI committed \$5 million to support spent fuel management and reactor decommissioning, a critical element in gaining the agreement of the Government of Yugoslavia to allow the nuclear weapons material to be removed.

In August, the fresh HEU fuel from the Vinca reactor was taken to Russia where it is now secure and will be blended down to a form unusable for weapons. The State Department said NTI's partnership was "key to the project's success." The U.S. Government has pledged to take action to secure vulnerable materials at a number of similar reactors throughout the world. The Congress is exploring how it can provide the necessary legislative authority to conduct and fund such operations without requiring private assistance in the future. This was a unique partnership among Russia, the U.S., Yugoslavia, the International Atomic Energy Agency and NTI.

2. CSIS/Global Coalition: As I described, NTI has invested time, voice and resources to develop and promote the idea of a Global Coalition against Catastrophic Terrorism to prevent terrorists from getting nuclear, biological and chemical weapons and materials. An important step forward in this process occurred in June when the G-8 leaders announced a "G-8 Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction" and committed \$20 billion over 10 years to support this work, starting with projects in Russia. NTI has developed a \$3 million project with the Center for Strategic and International Studies to engage a global coalition of think tanks to work to increase global support and resources for threat reduction in the former Soviet Union to help mobilize the G-8 commitment of funds. A major conference is planned for January 2003 to announce results of a survey on past contributions and to make specific recommendations of high priority projects to bring more resources to bear for this important work.

3. IAEA: NTI has contributed to and leveraged additional funds for the International Atomic Energy Agency's critical and woefully under-funded work to secure nuclear materials around the world. Last fall, NTI announced a pledge of \$1.2 million to support global efforts to secure vulnerable nuclear material. Our pledge has so far leveraged \$7.7 million in funding, including a \$1.2 million matching grant from the U.S. government.

4. World Health Organization/Emergency Outbreak Response Fund: Today, when an infectious disease breaks out in a poor country, it sometimes takes weeks for the World Health Organization (WHO) to raise enough money to respond and send help. A quick response is required to prevent the disease from spreading around the globe. NTI has provided \$500,000 to create a revolving fund to support rapid emergency response to infectious disease outbreaks. The fund will be replenished by the WHO through contributions both during an outbreak and following an outbreak. This will facilitate prompt response by the WHO to emerging epidemics.

We have more than \$30 million in nuclear, biological and chemical destruction programs, but I will leave you with these examples as we try to put all of this in some perspective.

PUTTING THINGS IN PERSPECTIVE

Despite all of the challenges we face in today's world, it is important that we keep our perspective and particularly help our young people put today's dangers in historical perspective.

Let me conclude by telling a story I heard years ago that can help us put things in perspective. A young college girl wrote to her parents and said: "Dear Mom and Dad, I'm sorry to be so long in writing you, but all of my stationery was destroyed the night the dorm was burned down by the demonstrators. The doctor says my eyesight should be back to normal sooner or later, in spite of the severe smoke damage. I'm enjoying living with this wonderful boy named Bill who I met soon after the fire. He was kind enough to share his small apartment with me until the dorm is rebuilt. You've always wanted to be grandparents and I have news for you – I'm expecting a child in July.

Then there was a big gap in the letter and it continued – Calm down, there was no fire, my eyes are great and I'm not pregnant – I don't even have a boyfriend. But I did get a D in math and an F in chemistry, and I wanted to be sure that you received this news in the proper perspective."

So, perspective is important. There are a great number of dangers facing America and the world, but I believe we are far safer from all-out nuclear war and world destruction than we were during the 40 years of the Cold War. Today, the danger of an all-out nuclear war is very low, but there is, as we have discussed, an increased danger of a nuclear accident or a terrorist attack using nuclear, biological or chemical weapons.

If the United States and Russia begin working together as partners in fighting terror and the weapons of mass destruction threat, and encourage others to join, the world will be a much safer place for our children and grandchildren. Yes – we face major challenges, but also an historic opportunity. We must seize it now.

###