A BRIDGE TO A NUCLEAR WEAPON-FREE WORLD CAN AND MUST BE BUILT.
MPI’S MISSION

MPI’s unique mission is to influence and assist middle power governments to encourage and educate the nuclear weapon states to commit to immediate practical steps to reduce nuclear dangers and commence negotiations to eliminate nuclear weapons.

In pursuit of this mission, MPI will continue to establish and develop effective relationships with middle power governments and relevant citizen organizations.

“Public opinion worldwide must be mobilised again as it was in the 1980s. Non-governmental organizations must play a vital role, working alongside committed governments…. The Middle Powers Initiative is the newest network supporting the New Agenda governments, and it has a wealth of expertise and experience in the field of nuclear disarmament. Civil society organizations are demonstrating that they are more effective than ever.”


“I thank you for the Middle Power Initiative’s support in advancing the New Agenda and look forward to working together with you on the further steps to advance the initiative.”

Brian Cowen, T.D., Minister for Foreign Affairs, Ireland, in a letter to Senator Douglas Roche.
As citizen organizations go, the Middle Powers Initiative (MPI) is still young. Yet, as we enter our fourth year, it is time for a progress report.

At our first meeting, March 19–20, 1998, we set out to influence and assist middle power governments to encourage and educate the nuclear weapon states to commit to immediate practical steps to reduce nuclear dangers and commence negotiations to eliminate nuclear weapons. We chose to develop effective relationships with middle power governments and relevant citizen organizations.

Since then, MPI has sent numerous delegations to governments, particularly the NATO States and other US-allied countries; held strategy consultations at sites as diversified as the United Nations, the Rockefeller Foundation, The Carter Center, Atlanta and the “Thinkers’ Lodge” at Pugwash, Nova Scotia; and published a body of literature, notably our centre-piece, Fast Track to Zero Nuclear Weapons: The Middle Powers Initiative, which highlights the deepening nuclear disarmament crisis, the need for rapid nuclear disarmament, and explores how MPI is working to support middle power governments in advancing such a goal.

In this same time period, the New Agenda countries have established themselves as the most powerful political force today to influence the nuclear states. MPI has built an informal, close working relationship with the New Agenda group. Together, the substantive work of like-minded governments and civil society experts is moving the nuclear disarmament agenda forward.

MPI’s diplomatic and political strategy is still evolving. We plan to deepen and strengthen this work as reflected in this report. I am profoundly grateful to my colleagues in this enterprise as well as to our funders and supporters.

MPI stands for the total elimination of nuclear weapons through a series of practical steps. We will stay focussed on helping the world community move rapidly towards this goal.

Senator Douglas Roche, O.C.
Chairman, Middle Powers Initiative
MPI’s strategy has focused on providing support for the New Agenda and like-minded countries and on promoting a shift in NATO nuclear policy away from reliance on nuclear deterrence and first use of nuclear weapons. MPI has pursued these goals through publications, international delegations to governments, government/NGO consultations, public outreach and an interparliamentary project.

**Publications**

- “Report from the Atlanta Consultation on the Future of the Non-Proliferation Treaty,” April 2000.
- Partial funding and distribution of *The Naked Nuclear Emperor: Debunking Nuclear Deterrence* by Robert Green. Foreword by Rt. Hon. Helen Clark, Prime Minister of New Zealand. Published by the Disarmament and Security Centre, New Zealand.

**International Delegations**

- July 1998: Ireland and Sweden
- September-December 1998: New Zealand, Canada, Japan, Australia, Germany and the Netherlands
- March 1999: Canada
- August 1999: Japan
- October 1999: Norway, Germany, Greece, Italy and the Netherlands
- November 1999: Japan
- March 2000: Japan
- May 2000: Japan (UN Mission, New York)
- October 2000: Ireland, Norway, Italy, Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium
- November 2000: Japan
Government/NGO Consultations and Forums

- October 14, 1999: Forum at the UN: “New Perspectives on Nuclear Disarmament” organized and facilitated by MPI for 40 government representatives and 20 NGO delegates.
- January 26-27, 2000: “Atlanta Consultation”: a strategy consultation with 45 international leaders co-sponsored by the Carter Center, with the participation of former US President Jimmy Carter.

Public Outreach to Decision-Makers and Citizen Groups

MPI organized panels for numerous conferences including the Hague Appeal for Peace (May 1999), NGO Committee on Disarmament panel discussions (1998, 1999 and 2000) and the State of the World Forum (1998, 1999 and 2000). International Steering Committee members participated as speakers and workshop leaders in a number of other conferences.

Parliamentary Network for Nuclear Disarmament

Between September 1999 and February 2000, MPI carried out a joint preliminary project with Parliamentarians for Global Action to determine interest on the part of PGA members in joining a network of parliamentarians specially focused on nuclear disarmament.
The Atlanta Consultation

January 26–27, 2000

At the Carter Center in Atlanta, Georgia, on January 26–27, 2000, three months before the opening of the 2000 Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference, the Middle Powers Initiative and the Carter Center co-sponsored a dialogue between government representatives of the United States, members of the New Agenda Coalition (Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa and Sweden), Canada and Germany, and NGO arms control and non-proliferation experts.

These representatives of diverse constituencies came together concerned by the dangers posed to the nuclear non-proliferation regime, in particular the threat to three crucial arms control treaties then in danger of unraveling: the 1968 Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and the 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. They identified the problems facing the nuclear non-proliferation regime from different perspectives and found common ground for actions, policies and programs that would preserve and strengthen the regime and further the goal of nuclear arms control and the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear dangers.

Several themes resonated throughout the meeting: the crucial role of the 2000 NPT Review Conference in determining the continuing viability of the Treaty; the need for much greater progress by the US and Russia in cutting their arsenals; as well as the importance of making substantive progress through elimination of tactical nuclear weapons, de-alerting, no-first-use commitments and a rethinking of deterrence. International parliamentarian exchanges were suggested as a means to strengthen political forces for disarmament. Greater efforts were also recommended to reinvigorate a bi-partisan approach in the US and to reach the media and the public. President Jimmy Carter, a key participant, followed up the consultation with a stirring op-ed in the Washington Post on February 23—“A Nuclear Crisis”—calling for US influence in preserving the NPT.

By bringing together senior U.S. officials with high level diplomats from the New Agenda group, this Consultation was considered to help pave the way for successful negotiation at the NPT Review Conference.
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Rick Diamond
ITH THE HISTORIC THINKERS’ LODGE AS THE SETTING, MPI HELD A strategy consultation in July at the Pugwash Park Commission in Nova Scotia, Canada in order to develop a long-range vision for MPI. In keeping with the tradition of low-profile meetings with broad governmental and NGO participation and a focused, action-oriented theme, the Pugwash Consultation invitees included MPI members and other key NGO representatives, officials from leading New Agenda members Ireland and New Zealand, funders, and a representative from the United Nations.

At the heart of the discussion was one question: what should be MPI’s priorities for the next five years? Facing the conflicting realities that the NPT Final Document commits the nuclear weapon states to elimination of nuclear weapons but their national policies consistently contradict those commitments, MPI examined several interlocking strategies. Besides support for the NPT decisions and the New Agenda, MPI decided to encourage the NATO doctrine review to move away from deterrence to a non-nuclear defense policy and to work to counter the damage to arms control that would be caused by the US plans to deploy national missile defenses (NMD).

In evaluating MPI’s work since its inception, participants identified a number of areas in which MPI enjoys a “comparative advantage”—work where MPI’s unique characteristics make it especially effective. One advantage is MPI’s diplomatic and political access to the middle powers, where MPI has standing with both governments and parliaments. It was pointed out that the goals of meetings in capitals were not only to gain government support for the New Agenda but also to encourage US allies to pressure the US, saying, “We are here because we want you to influence the US.” MPI’s inclusive consultations were also seen as contributing to its success.

Two aspects of MPI’s relations with its core governmental constituency—the New Agenda—were stressed: relations with the New Agenda as a whole and with each country. There was the feeling that the New Agenda is now so integral a part of the governments’ policies that there was no need to work to sustain member sup-

continued on next page
MPI’s focus on changing NATO’s nuclear strategy was seen as helping the New Agenda position, therefore more work with NATO states was not seen as a shift in priorities. A related question was whether MPI should engage with the nuclear weapon states, which are not middle powers. Accepting the analysis that, despite the five nuclear weapon states’ common position at the NPT Conference, they are not truly united, this leaves open the possibility that each could be approached with individual strategies. The NPT Review showed that the UK is the most open to negotiations, with the US second. China professes to support negotiating a Nuclear Weapons Convention, but is sensitive about transparency and US NMD plans. There is little hope of influencing Russia at the moment, but there may be future openings. France is the most resistant. It was stressed that it was important not to duplicate the work already underway by other NGOs.

In the final session—for MPI only—the International Steering Committee and country representatives drew up a long-range strategy document for the next five years (see page opposite). The process of developing priorities for the elements in the strategy outline continues. The next strategic planning meeting will take place on February 22-25 in Santa Barbara, California.
Mission

MPI's unique mission is to influence and assist middle power governments to encourage and educate the nuclear weapon states to commit to immediate practical steps to reduce nuclear dangers and commence negotiations to eliminate nuclear weapons.

In pursuit of this mission, MPI will continue to establish and develop effective relationships with middle power governments and relevant citizen organizations.

Goals

MPI will continue to concentrate on identified middle power countries, encouraging them to press the nuclear weapon states to commence negotiations forthwith on a treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons, and to implement the 13 steps in paragraph 15 of the section on Article VI in the 2000 NPT Review Conference Final Document.

Objectives

1) New Agenda Coalition.* MPI will focus on strengthening the NAC by: promoting its UN General Assembly resolution; boosting parliamentary and NGO support for the NAC’s agenda, including within NAC countries; and offering input into the development of NAC strategies.

2) NATO and Other US Allies. MPI will send delegations to selected non-nuclear NATO member states (Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and Norway) in early October of each year in order to promote the NAC resolution at the UN and to advocate a non-nuclear NATO strategy, involving parliamentarians and citizen organizations in this process. MPI will apply similar strategies to other US allies such as Australia, Canada, and Japan.

Consideration will also be given to a joint consultation in Brussels with officials and parliamentarians from key NATO countries.

3) Consultations. MPI will consider the feasibility of organizing and facilitating a strategy consultation, in cooperation with the UN Department for Disarmament Affairs, with middle power governments and citizen organizations to advance the proposal of UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan for a global conference on reducing nuclear dangers.

In addition, MPI will organize and facilitate a strategy consultation on the first anniversary of the 2000 NPT Review Conference (May 2001) to evaluate progress in implementing the 2000 NPT Review Final Document.

MPI will also hold strategy consultations, with the involvement of key middle power representatives and citizen organizations, in the capitals of the nuclear weapon states.

4) Parliamentary Network. MPI will continue to develop the Parliamentary Network for Nuclear Disarmament (PNND) in cooperation with Parliamentarians for Global Action in identified middle power countries, and deepen its relations with parliamentarians in general.

5) Additional Outreach. MPI will explore ways to further develop and strengthen its relationships with country representatives in the NAC, selected non-nuclear NATO member states and other key states.

MPI representation will be maintained at the UN to facilitate development of the Secretary-General’s proposal for the UN Conference, MPI strategic consultations, enhancement of the NAC’s work, and related activities in the run-up to the 2005 NPT Review Conference.

6) Publications. MPI will continue to prepare, update and distribute publications as appropriate, in order to improve MPI’s outreach. MPI will also create shorter abstracts from existing MPI publications, and give priority to translating these.

MPI will prepare and distribute an Annual Report and supplemental quarterly updates.

The website will be modernized and updated.

*Originally named the “New Agenda Coalition”, the group shortened its name to “New Agenda” in 2000.
MIDDLE POWERS INITIATIVE INTERNATIONAL DELEGATION OF SENATOR DOUGLAS Roche, O.C., Commander Robert Green, Royal Navy (Retired) and Dr. Scilla Elworthy met with Senior Defense and Foreign Ministry officials, parliamentarians and NGOs in Oslo, Rome, Berlin, The Hague and Brussels, October 5–13, 2000. The five countries of Norway, Italy, Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium (some call them the “NATO 5”) acted in unison at the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference of 2000 and, with Canada, form the heart of the non-nuclear weapon countries within NATO. The delegation also met with officials at NATO headquarters in Brussels. A fourth such delegation is planned for October 2001.

The MPI delegation:

1. Advocated a “yes” vote on the New Agenda resolution which was then before the United Nations First Committee on the grounds that the resolution faithfully repeats the consensus language of Paragraph 15 of the 2000 NPT Review Conference Final Document, which secured from the nuclear weapon states “an unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals.” The resolution repeats the 13 practical steps adopted by all NATO member States in the document to implement the agreement for action made at the 1995 Indefinite Extension of the NPT.

2. Urged NATO governments to push for a substantive, comprehensive and timely review of NATO’s nuclear weapons policies. The delegation distributed an MPI Position Paper, “Re-Thinking NATO’s Nuclear Policy,” which points out that NATO’s Strategic Concept stating that nuclear weapons “continue to fulfill an essential role” is not consistent with the unequivocal undertaking to total elimination made at NPT 2000.

3. Warned that if the United States proceeds with the implementation of a National Missile Defense (NMD) system, it will have disastrous effects on the entire international arms control regime, including START, the CTBT and the NPT. It was also pointed out that the development of NMD will lead directly to the weaponization of space. Governments were urged to make strong representations to Washington before the new Administration took office. An Aide-Memoire, summarizing MPI’s arguments, was given to all interlocutors.
Conclusions:

1. A breakthrough to 16 “yes” votes by the NATO non-nuclear weapons states on the New Agenda resolution was MPI’s goal. This was exceeded when the US and the UK joined in a “yes” vote. The final vote in the UN General Assembly was 154 in favor, 3 opposed (India, Pakistan, Israel) and 8 abstentions (including Russia and France). Consolidating the NPT 13 Practical Steps in a UN resolution was an important step forward for the New Agenda. By its high level of credibility and diplomatic skills, the New Agenda has become a powerful political force for nuclear disarmament.

2. NATO is still dodging its responsibilities to make its nuclear policies conform to the NPT. There can be no doubt that, if NATO persists in its present recalcitrance on its nuclear posture, it will stand in violation of both the “good faith” requirement of the NPT and the unanimous decision of the International Court of Justice in its 1996 Advisory Opinion that negotiations to eliminate nuclear weapons must be concluded. The tour of the NATO 5 plus NATO headquarters convinced the delegation that NATO’s credibility and cohesiveness are threatened in ways that do not seem to have dawned on member governments. Unless NATO is seen to move rapidly to make its posture coherent with the NPT 2000 document, it will stand condemned as a primary impediment to genuine nuclear disarmament. NATO is making a perilous assumption if it thinks that, just because the public and parliaments are for the most part quiet, it can any longer maintain its core nuclear doctrine. The historical momentum of nuclear abolitionist forces is growing, now boosted by the 2000 NPT Review document. Sooner or later, a rupture in NATO will occur over nuclear weapons, and the NATO leadership will find that its prized cohesion can only be maintained by changing the Strategic Concept to rely on conventional, not nuclear, deterrence.

3. Time is of the essence in halting NMD deployment. The destabilization of the international community which will occur upon implementation of NMD will leave no country untouched. The US is not impervious to the weight of world public opinion. Before conclusive steps are taken, the US government, executive and legislative branches alike, need to hear from allied governments and the advanced wing of civil society about the disastrous consequences of proceeding with NMD. More courage needs to be combined with perspicacity on this matter.
HE MAY 2000 NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY (NPT) REVIEW CONFERENCE, WHICH had begun with bleak prospects for success, ended with a historic breakthrough—a consensus agreement in which the nuclear weapon states committed to “an unequivocal undertaking” to accomplish the total elimination of their arsenals, a de-coupling of nuclear disarmament from general and complete disarmament, an agreement that the Conference on Disarmament establish a body with “a mandate to deal with nuclear disarmament” and a set of 13 “practical steps for the systematic and progressive efforts to implement” the nuclear disarmament commitments of the NPT.

Despite the ground-breaking nature of these accomplishments, there was little evidence that these commitments would be worth more than the paper on which they were printed until the meeting of the UN’s First Committee. It was here that the New Agenda countries introduced their resolution for a third year, this time re-writing the text to fit almost exactly with the 13 practical steps. The resolution, therefore, became a reaffirmation of the obligations that the nuclear weapon states themselves had agreed to in May. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 154 in favor, (including China, the UK and the US), three opposed (India, Israel, Pakistan), and eight abstaining (including France and Russia).

UN Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs Jayantha Dhanapala called the New Agenda resolution the “most important” resolution coming out of this year’s First Committee, remarking that it was “acceptable to the three nuclear weapon states that voted for it and also attracted a lot of support from NATO countries which had abstained earlier. Clearly they have a larger following.... We must now see what next steps they will adopt in order to implement what was in the NPT Final Document.”

The breakthrough achieved at the NPT Review—the explicit acknowledgement by the nuclear powers that the obligation to abolish nuclear weapons exists—was seen as a vindication of the abolition agenda and immediately became a centerpiece of the next phase of the campaign for nuclear disarmament.

On October 17, two weeks prior to the First Committee’s vote, MPI held a strategic consultation on the theme of translating the 13 “practical steps” into concrete action, starting with the New Agenda resolution as the most immediate vehicle. The consultation took place in the conference room of Under-Secretary-General Jayantha Dhanapala. Representatives of the New Agenda states, other key non-nuclear states, and NGOs attended. Randy Rydell, Senior Political Affairs Officer in the Department for Disarmament Affairs represented Mr. Dhanapala.
MPI Chairman Douglas Roche opened the meeting by asking the participants to think about the meaning of the NPT’s “unequivocal undertaking” as supported by the 13 steps, and about how progress on them could be measured.

Participants described how, despite obstacles, the New Agenda countries had achieved success at the NPT review. Speaking for the New Agenda, Ambassador Henrik Salander of Sweden said that before the NPT Conference, the New Agenda was unjustly accused of being confrontational, but that its “result-based dialogue” had led it to enter the NPT Conference with proposals that were firm enough to connect disarmament and non-proliferation, yet flexible enough to be the basis for talks. The strategy “paid off,” leading to “ground breaking pledges” that held the NPT together. Ambassador Salander characterized the 13 steps as both better and worse than expected: they were worse because they demonstrated little progress, but better because they were “seriously negotiated commitments with a strengthened review process to follow them up.”

New Agenda representatives shared with the group a remarkably precise analysis of their resolution’s chances for success. The sponsors felt that at least two or three nuclear weapon states were “looking seriously” at a yes vote and that small changes in the draft would accommodate them. A NATO country representative felt that total NATO support was within reach.

New Agenda representatives acknowledged that some countries, particularly the Non-Aligned, felt the new draft was too moderate and “less attractive”. However, the goal of the draft was to reinforce the NPT. Another New Agenda representative said he had heard “disturbing noises” that the NPT decision does not extend beyond the NPT mechanism itself. He said a successful New Agenda resolution would confirm that the commitment is broader than the Treaty itself. As to a concern that the more moderate New Agenda draft might not be supported by civil society; this fear was discounted by MPI, saying, “They understand, they know this is a victory.” Another non-New Agenda delegate noted that the name New Agenda “comes with a lot of baggage” in some capitals but that this year the reaction had been “fundamentally different.”

Robert Green, Chair of MPI’s Strategic Planning Committee, briefed the meeting about MPI’s tour of the “NATO 5” countries, expressing “a real state of denial” within NATO. “They are in a new and unexpected situation,” Commander Green said. Since NATO had not expected a strong document from the NPT Review, they did not fully understand the meaning of the “unequivocal undertaking” for the Alliance. Consultations such as this provide essential assistance to MPI in clarifying its own next steps.

In this exchange of strategic thinking, the NGOs were also able to sound out the group on various other proposals for advancing the nuclear disarmament agenda. This meeting led MPI to confirm its plans for holding a larger invitational consultation at the UN in late April. The focus will be on measuring countries’ progress in implementing the NPT 13 Practical Steps.
As citizen representatives to government, parliamentarians are a vital link between civil society and national leaders. From the very beginning, one of MPI’s priorities has been to build bridges among parliamentarians around the world. Many of our colleagues believe that informing and motivating parliamentarians is one of the most important roles MPI can play.

In 1999, MPI, in partnership with Parliamentarians for Global Action (PGA), took the first steps to develop the Parliamentary Network for Nuclear Disarmament (PNND). The goal was to build a support network for parliamentarians, (especially in the nuclear weapon states and their allies), who would challenge their governments on nuclear disarmament issues, such as those put forth by the New Agenda and in the disarmament commitments in the NPT.

In February 2000, PGA sent a packet of disarmament information to their 1400 member parliamentarians, which included the MPI publication Fast Track to Zero Nuclear Weapons and an invitation to help create this new parliamentary network. Over 125 parliamentarians in 46 countries agreed to join. They were then contacted and engaged by MPI delegations, in particular those sent to NATO countries and Japan, and by groups working with MPI in these and other countries. Motivated and inspired by these contacts, the MPs used their positions in parliament to increase media attention to the issues and to press for their governments’ support of the New Agenda.

Further progress on the PNND was hampered in 2000 by lack of funds and institutional resources. MPI has now decided to restructure the PNND, seek additional resources and take a more direct management role. In 2001–2002, MPI will:

1. Increase the membership of the PNND to 250;
2. Hold a planning and strategy meeting of the PNND;
3. Arrange for MP exchanges to facilitate inter-parliamentary communication and cooperation;
4. Encourage and assist direct MP participation in international disarmament fora, primarily through membership on government delegations;
5. Provide ongoing information to members including updates on international progress and initiatives, and examples of parliamentary actions;
6. Focus MP attention on issues and opportunities including:
   a) NATO review,
   b) implementation of the 13 practical steps agreed to at the 2000 NPT Review,
   c) International Court of Justice 1996 Advisory Opinion and its relevance to nuclear doctrine and to strengthening nuclear weapon-free zones,
   d) nuclear deterrence doctrine, and
   e) possibilities for progress towards a nuclear weapons convention.
FINANCIAL REPORT

Since its inception three years ago, MPI has maintained a favorable financial position thanks to the vision and generosity of several foundations, organizations, and individual contributors.

MPI’s finances are administered by the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) based in Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, where MPI is headquartered. As a co-sponsor of MPI, and as a tax-exempt, not-for-profit institution, IPPNW serves as the 501(c)3 fiscal agent for MPI.

The expenses and revenues of MPI, which are maintained in a separate account within IPPNW, are included in the full independent audit of IPPNW prepared by Alexander, Aronson & Finning, Certified Public Accountants. IPPNW files an annual audited financial report based on a Fiscal Year of July 1 to June 30.

I am pleased to report that in FY 2000, MPI ended the year with a positive fund balance of $104,597. Program and operating expenses totaled $268,387 for the year, while revenue totaled $235,498. This differential was anticipated and covered by assets carried over from the previous year.

What is not accounted for in the MPI financial statements is the extraordinary spirit of volunteerism that pervades all aspects of MPI’s work. The investment of time, experience, and personal and organizational resources from within MPI has amplified the impact of our modest budget and thus facilitated the many accomplishments highlighted in this report.

On behalf of the Executive Committee, the International Steering Committee, and the Co-Sponsors of MPI, we would like to express our deepest gratitude to those listed below who provided MPI the resources to make a difference. We reaffirm our commitment to fulfilling the hope and confidence that their support represents.

Michael Christ
IPPNW Executive Director and Treasurer of MPI

DONOR LIST

Carnegie Corporation of New York
Senator Alan Cranston
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment
Kitty Kallen Granoff
W. Alton Jones Foundation
The John Merck Fund
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
The Ploughshares Fund
Roche Securities, Inc.
The Rockefeller Foundation
Samuel Rubin Foundation

The Second Chance Foundation
The Simons Foundation
Soka Gakkai International
State of the World Forum
The Streisand Foundation
**International Steering Committee**

Douglas Roche, O.C.
*Chairman & Chair of Executive Committee*
Douglas Roche is an author, parliamentarian and diplomat. He was appointed to the Senate of Canada in 1998. As Canada’s Ambassador for Disarmament from 1984–1989, he was elected Chairman of the United Nations Disarmament Committee at the 43rd General Assembly in 1988.

Colin Archer
*Mr. Archer has been Secretary-General of the International Peace Bureau since 1990. He is co-founder of the Institute for Law and Peace and board member of The Hague Appeal for Peace.*

Michael Christ
*Treasurer & Executive Committee Member*
Mr. Christ is Executive Director of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW). Mr. Christ led IPPNW’s World Court Project to persuade the World Health Organization and the United Nations to challenge the legality of nuclear weapons at the International Court of Justice.

Kate Dewes, Ph.D.
*Dr. Dewes is a Vice President of the International Peace Bureau, a member of the New Zealand Public Advisory Committee on Disarmament and Arms Control and Coordinator, with Robert Green, of the Disarmament and Security Centre in Christchurch, New Zealand. Her doctoral thesis records the history of the World Court Project.*

Scilla Elworthy, Ph.D.
*Dr. Elworthy is Director of the Oxford Research Group. She lectures on international security issues in most European countries, China, Russia, the United States and Japan. She has been a member of the Pugwash Council of Experts and a research consultant to the European Parliament and the Council of Europe.*

Jonathan Granoff, J.D.
*Finance and Fundraising Committee Chair and Executive Committee Member*
Mr. Granoff is CEO of the Global Security Institute; Vice President of Lawyers Alliance for World Security and its UN Representative; Vice President of the NGO Committee on Disarmament at the UN, and Chair of the American Bar Association Committee on Arms Control and Disarmament.

Commander Robert Green,
*Royal Navy (Retired)*
*Strategic Planning Committee Chair & Executive Committee Member*
Commander Green serves as Chair of World Court Project U.K. and Coordinator, with Dr. Kate Dewes, of the Disarmament & Security Centre in Christchurch, New Zealand. He is focusing on challenging the legal status of nuclear weapons and promoting safer, non-nuclear alternative security strategies.

David Krieger, Ph.D.
*Editorial Committee Chair & Executive Committee Member*
Dr. Krieger is a founder of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation and has served as its President since 1982. He is also Deputy Chair of Engineers and Scientists for Global Responsibility.

Ronald McCoy, M.D.
*Dr. McCoy was a member of the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons. He is Chair of Malaysian Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, and was formerly Co-President of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW).*

Bruna Nota
*Ms. Nota is presently the International President of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF). She has been involved with national and international organizations emphasizing principled, non-violent conflict resolution, as well as economic and social justice.*
THANK YOU ALAN CRANSTON FOR A LIFE SO WELL LIVED.

Inspired by Senator Cranston’s exemplary life of service to country and all humanity, the members of the Middle Powers Initiative pledge to finish his life’s work: the worldwide abolition of nuclear weapons and the pursuit of peace.

In this work we are guided by the philosophy that informed his noble career:

A leader is best when people barely know that he exists, less good when they obey and acclaim him, worse when they fear and despise him. Fail to honor people and they fail to honor you. But a good leader, when his work is done, his aim fulfilled, they will all say, “We did this ourselves.” — Lao-tzu

Senator Cranston sought no honor for himself; he honored all life itself through his service. Alan, thank you.

Senator Cranston was a member of MPI’s International Steering Committee from its founding until his death, December 31, 2000.
Country Representatives

Tony D’Costa — Ireland
Mr. D’Costa is a member of the Disarmament and Security Commission of Pax Christi International, representing Ireland.

Xanthe Hall — Germany
Ms. Hall is Campaign Director for the German Section of IPPNW—Artze für die Verhütung des Atomkrieges.

Karel Koster — The Netherlands
Mr. Koster is Director of the Project on European Nuclear Non-proliferation (PENN), Netherlands.

Lars G. Lindskog — Sweden
Mr. Lindskog is Media Consultant to the Swedish Physicians Against Nuclear Weapons (Svenska Lakare mot Karnvapen).

Dr. Arthur Muhl — Switzerland
Dr. Muhl is President and long-time member of the Swiss affiliate of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW). His work has concentrated on direct approaches to nuclear weapons decision-makers, nuclear weapon free zones and creating an overall strategy for abolition.

Bahig Nassar — Egypt
Mr. Nassar is Co-ordinator of the Arab Coordination Center of NGOs.

Terje Stokstad — Norway
Mr. Stokstad was an activist for Nei til Atomvapen (NTA) from 1982 until 1991, and has served on its main board as Vice-Chair and Chair since 1992.

Professor Hiromichi Umebayashi — Japan
Professor Umebayashi is President of the Peace Depot, and International Coordinator of the Pacific Campaign for Disarmament and Security (PCDS).

Sue Wareham, MB BS — Australia
Dr. Wareham is a general practitioner in Canberra where she is currently president of the Medical Association for Prevention of War (Australia), and is a former board member of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW).

MPI Staff

Suzanne Pearce
Executive Director

Jim Wurst
United Nations Coordinator

Laura Rótolo
Program Assistant
Senator Douglas Roche  
Chairman  
Middle Powers Initiative  
Victoria Building, Room 202  
Ottawa, Ontario

Dear Senator,

I would like to take this opportunity to offer my appreciation for the substantial contribution made by the Middle Powers Initiative (MPI) in striving towards the elimination of nuclear weapons.

In the brief period since its creation, MPI has taken significant steps to assist governments in advancing the nuclear disarmament agenda. Your focus on promoting synergy between like-minded governments, parliamentarians and civil society to work together for nuclear disarmament is commendable and should be intensified. Last year’s high-level MPI delegation to Ottawa, which was received by our Prime Minister, and your tour of NATO capitals, have been particularly helpful in the domestic and international contexts in which DFAIT operates.

MPI is playing a unique role in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation and I wish the organization all the best in the coming year.

Sincerely,

Lloyd Axworthy
MIDDLE POWERS INITIATIVE

Co-Sponsors
Global Security Institute
International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms
International Network of Engineers and Scientists for Global Responsibility
International Peace Bureau
International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
Parliamentarians for Global Action
State of the World Forum
Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom

Central Office:
Middle Powers Initiative
727 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139
USA

Phone: (617) 492-9189
Fax: (617) 868-2560
E-mail: mpi@ippnw.org
Web: www.middlepowers.org

Please visit our website at www.middlepowers.org