

# Canada Is Missing Its Chance to Shut the Gate on Nuclear Weapons Everywhere

By [Prof. M. V. Ramana](#) and [Lauren Borja](#)

Global Research, October 27, 2017

[The Conversation](#) 3 October 2017

Region: [Canada](#)

Theme: [Law and Justice](#), [Military and Militarization](#) and [WMD](#)

*Last month, the [Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons](#) (or the Ban Treaty) opened for signatures to all member states at the United Nations. The treaty is a product of sustained activism by civil society and key non-nuclear weapon states.*

As researchers who study nuclear policy, we see this development as a landmark in the struggle to eliminate nuclear weapons.

The Ban Treaty would make it illegal for signatories to develop, produce, test, possess, use, threaten to use, or transfer nuclear weapons, among other restrictions.

Within days of being opened for signature, 53 countries have signed the treaty, and [three have ratified](#). After signature and ratification by at least 50 countries, it comes into force.

Canada, a historical supporter of nuclear disarmament, has [neither signed nor even participated in the negotiations](#) that led to the treaty, which could become the most significant step toward nuclear disarmament since the [Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty \(NPT\)](#) of 1970.

## Humanitarian shift in nuclear arms control

The Ban Treaty was motivated by a clear recognition that the humanitarian impacts of nuclear weapons use and testing should be at the forefront of all discussions about these weapons. [Dr. Tilman Ruff](#), co-president of [International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War](#) testified at the United Nations in March:

“An understanding of what nuclear weapons do invalidates all arguments for continued possession of these weapons and requires that they urgently be prohibited and eliminated as the only course of action commensurate with the existential danger they pose.”

The Ban Treaty, therefore, represents a shift in nuclear arms control, away from talking about nuclear weapons in terms of security and deterrence to focusing on the horrendous consequences of nuclear warfare.

This shift is reflected in the language of the [Preamble of the Treaty](#) which highlights concerns that the “catastrophic consequences of nuclear weapons” would “transcend national borders” and “pose grave implications for human survival.” The Treaty also posits that “complete” elimination “remains the only way to guarantee that nuclear weapons are

never used again under any circumstances.”

## **Canada abandons traditional arms control emphasis**

An emphasis on the humanitarian consequences, however, is not unique within arms control. Other forms of warfare, such as land mines, biological and chemical weapons, have also been outlawed because of such concerns. And such humanitarian concerns have often guided Canada’s diplomacy in the past, as illustrated by its [leading role](#) in the appropriately named [Ottawa Convention](#) to ban landmines.

Not in this case. In seeking to justify not attending the negotiations at the United Nations, a spokesperson for Canada’s minister of foreign affairs, **Chrystia Freeland**, [dismissed the Nuclear Ban Treaty as “certain to be ineffective”](#) because of a lack of participation by nuclear weapon states.

## **Treaties can reshape behaviour**

Even in the case of the Ottawa Treaty, many countries that deployed landmines, such as the United States, declined to sign onto it in 1997. Yet, the treaty did affect policies in countries beyond those that signed it.

In 2014, the [United States stopped using landmines, except in the Korean Peninsula](#). Treaty negotiations do in fact shift global norms and impact military plans, even if they may not be legally enforceable in countries that are non-signatories.

Multilateral treaties can serve to unify the international community against those who use them. Chemical weapons use in Syria “triggered an unprecedented international response” and “led to the creation of an ambitious plan to eliminate Syria’s chemical weapons program and prevent future use or proliferation of these abhorrent weapons,” as the [Global Affairs Canada website on chemical weapons policy](#) explains.

Without a treaty in place, such a concerted global effort would be much harder to mount.

## **Step-by-step process at standstill**

Rather than involve itself with the Ban Treaty, Canada has emphasized the so-called step-by-step process for nuclear disarmament. The [Global Affairs Canada website on nuclear weapons policy](#) offers “NPT universalization, entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT)” as “more practical and realistic options to pursue in the short and medium term.”

Characterizing these as practical and realistic is misleading. The [CTBT](#) was negotiated in 1996 and has still not come into force, largely as a result of [opposition within the U.S. Congress](#). The Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty, or [FMCT process](#), has been stalled as well — the last time it gained momentum was in 1995 with the establishment of the [mandate under Canadian Ambassador Gerald Shannon](#).

That did not lead to actual negotiations — which still have not begun. The step-by-step process isn’t going anywhere anytime soon.

Furthermore, arguments about what is more practical and realistic only distract from

potential action. Nothing prevents Canada or any other country without nuclear weapons from pursuing both traditional arms control measures like the FMCT and engaging with the Ban Treaty. The latter is sure to open up several options to further nuclear disarmament.

Constructive participation in the evolving effort to prohibit nuclear weapons, regardless of whether Canada signs the Ban Treaty or not, is the only way to explore this space and identify fruitful next steps.

### **Looking ahead on nuclear disarmament**

There has been widespread political support within Canada for being more active in furthering nuclear disarmament. In 2010, both the Senate and House of Commons unanimously adopted a [resolution encouraging the Government of Canada](#) “to engage in negotiations for a nuclear weapons convention” and “deploy a major worldwide Canadian diplomatic initiative in support of preventing nuclear proliferation and increasing the rate of nuclear disarmament.” The dynamic set off by the Ban Treaty offers a suitable opening for launching such an initiative.

In April of this year, Chrystia Freeland issued the following [statement](#) to mark the 20th anniversary of the entry into force of the Chemical Weapons Convention:

“Twenty years ago today, the international community was united in denouncing the use of chemical weapons by anyone, anywhere, under any circumstance.”

Isn't it time for the same to be said about nuclear weapons?

The original source of this article is [The Conversation](#)

Copyright © [Prof. M. V. Ramana](#) and [Lauren Borja](#), [The Conversation](#), 2017

---

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Prof. M. V. Ramana](#) and [Lauren Borja](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)  
[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)