MIDDLE POWERS INITIATIVE MEETING
Atlanta Consultation
Jan. 21, 2010

: Thank you, Jonathan. I was enjoying that very much.

agreed to help North Korea develop water cooler reactors to replace the old graphite moderated reactors they were operating.

Later, as you know, when President Bush came into office, he disavowed this agreement with North Korea. Partially as a result of that, the North Koreans have embarked on a path that has led them to demonstrate the capability of partially successful nuclear explosives, and we don't know where they will go from here.

For a long time before I went there in 1994, the United States had refused to communicate in any way with the North Koreans and my own belief, then and now, was that it's better, if you ha hwit

Ballistic Missile Treaty; Russia has also disavowed it. When I was president, the US pledged not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states. The George W. Bush A

by the United States and Russia, and then by the other nuclear powers, still remains to be seen.

But so far, I think without the effective end position of the Middle Powers and others, we won't see any real move made between the United States, Great Britain, France, China, and Russia to comply with their commitment to the Non-Proliferation Treaty any more than they have complied in the past. I hope that will happen, but I have serious doubts. We must be very fervent in our efforts.

A threat to the Non-Proliferation Treaty I faced when I was president came from India. We knew that India had done a test explosion in 1974, Prime Minister Desai of India and I had a very close, personal relationship, but we had one bone of contention between us and that was India's demand that we provide them with fuel and nuclear technology even though they refused to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty. I refused, and all of my successors did the same thing until more recently, when the Bush administration decided to sell to them. I wrote all of you a letter and wrote op-ed pieces and so forth, trying to get this move blocked. As you know, the legislation passed by Congressman Henry Hyde put some strict limits on India, which I think they have still refused to accept. They couldn't test any nuclear weapons; they could not sell nuclear capability to any other country, and they couldn't refuel any of their existing nuclear power plants. I don't think they have accepted any restraints on their future nuclear progress, which is extremely difficult to rationalize to Pakistan. Now we know that Pakistan's nuclear arsenal is at least in some danger of being taken over in future years by militants who might overthrow the government. So that's a quagmire that's even more serious than the threats from Iran and North Korea. I don't really see the likelihood of Iran, even if they do develop nuclear weapons in the future, launching those weapons at another country. If they should launch a weapon against Israel, there is no doubt in my mind that the United States would respond accordingly and with much overwhelming power, so it would be almost suicidal for the Iranians to develop one or two or three or five nuclear weapons and to use them in an attack. But that's always a possibility that ought not to be excluded.

I was even more deeply involved during my presidency in the Middle East peace process. A major cause of our attention to this region had to do with what happened during the October War of 1973. Egypt and Syria made major strides during their surprise attack on Israel, and when Israel responded by moving toward Cairo, having crossed the Suez Canal with their forces, the Soviets threatened to use their nuclear weapons unless the Israeli advance was stopped. This is the only time I believe there has been a so called "red alert" involving nuclear arsenals in history. I may be wrong

argued with Sam Nunn about this-- but there is very little evidence so far that Sam's group and the Global Zero folks are willing to cooperate with each other. This creates confusion in the minds of people. If they could harness their common effort and speak with a single voice I think they could be much more effective, I also think that this applies to the Japan/Australia group which Gareth Evans has been so greatly involved in.

So we have some new developments in a potentially beneficial way. I think President Obama's declaration was influenced by some of these nice groups I just mentioned, and we have increasingly publicized threats from North Korea and potentially Iran. I think among more deeply analytical minds the threat out of Pakistan may be more pre-eminent -- in my mind it is -- more so than a t