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Pugwash

- Founded 1957 – organic response of scientists
- More than 400 Track Two meetings
- Varying types (no ‘one model fits all’)
- Hard to put a neat theoretical label on messy business
- They were feeling their way instinctively through the dark days of the Cold War before “Track Two” was “Track Two”
Jones:

“Transfer of what, to whom”

Sounds easy, but....
Russell-Einstein Manifesto

- 9 July 1955, signed by 11 eminent scientists
- Response to hydrogen bomb tests
- Showed people could agree across the Iron Curtain
- Einstein’s final act

Transfer of the importance of Track Two to the public
Are there times when one is engaging in Track Two without sitting at a table?

“AS MEMBERS OF A SPECIES”

One cannot deny that Bertrand Russell, the late Albert Einstein, and seven other thinkers and philosophers were expressing what might be called a global patriotism when they signed the statement on nuclear warfare released by Lord Russell on Saturday. They were hon-
New role for scientists?

“[T]he idea that scientists should take an active part in world affairs was evidently approved by public opinion.”

Joseph Rotblat

Constituency building as a Track Two product
First Pugwash Conference

- 1957 – Pugwash, Nova Scotia
- Atmosphere was critical
- Courageous funding source (Eaton)

Transferred the validity of Track Two to the public
Importance of scientific language

- 1957 working group accepted “linear no threshold” theory

Rotblat: “as a pack of individuals we have no power whatsoever, only intellectual muscle...nevertheless we managed to influence the thinking very often, and the reaching of agreements on an official governmental level”

Transfer narrative-changing language to practitioners
Partial Test Ban Treaty

- Proposal for sealed, automatic seismic recording devices – “black boxes”
- Significant technical breakthrough
- Failure? (no comprehensive ban)
- ...or success? (addressed Soviet concerns re: intrusive inspections)
- Evangelista: Seeds planted for future work

What is transferred when a “failure” leads to “success” on another front?
July 1967 – Aubrac and Marcovich take formula to Ho Chi Minh

Kissinger intimately involved – not yet in govt

“Failed” but laid groundwork for San Antonio proposal

Transferred conflict resolution formula to highest levels
ABM Treaty

- 1964 Udaipur - Millionshchikov (later became Speaker of the Russian Parliament) argued Soviet Union should have ABM
- Ruina & Gell-Mann paper opposes idea
- Soviets argue against ABMs in subsequent mtgs
- Millionshchikov later says he was won over in ’64

- What is the timeline for transfer?

Transferred transformative concept to key person – “Asymmetric Transfer”?
CFE Treaty

- 1980s – Pugwash working group on non-offensive defense involved key thinkers
- 1987 – engage directly with Gorbachev via letters (von Hippel/Kokoshin)
- Gorbachev withdraws 10,000 tanks from E. Europe

Transfer of policy proposal to highest levels – but who ‘owns’ the transfer?
Chemical and Biological Weapons

- 1959 conference – “the first clear marker on the route towards the new international anti-CBW regime” (Perry Robinson)
- 1963 “informal beach discussions” pave way toward inspection team plan
- Kissinger’s “first exposure to serious arms-control thinking about BW”

Transfer on many levels – including directly to govts
Characteristics of Pugwash CBW work

Perry Robinson:

- 1) person-to-person contacts, incl with govt
- 2) continuity of contacts
- 3) conduct research
- 4) communicating to the world at large
- Also engaged new constituency – industry

“What is unique about Pugwash...is the sustained attempt to do all four together and, to the degree that is now evident, to have succeeded in the attempt.”
Evangelista: new “transnational organization”

Soviet American Disarmament Study Group (SADS), led by Paul Doty, later evolved into CISAC at the US National Academies of Science

CBW work contributed to founding of SIPRI

Transfer of a *modus operandi* & people to other efforts

Is it success or failure when spawning spin-offs?
• Policy makers transferred to scientists an understanding of how to influence policy
• Peacemaking by amateurs? “Dupes?” (Gaffney)
• Policy makers also learn from engagement

Transfer of skills/capacity building goes in both directions to/from halls of power
Intergenerational capacity building

- York: “the trick that Pugwash succeeded at was inviting future officials. That’s the trick. That’s the hard part. Primakov wasn’t ex-foreign minister, he became foreign minister.”

- Holdren: “[Rotblat] probably accomplished equally as much through the efforts of others that he inspired, that he has energized, that he has motivated, that he has propelled, that he has embarrassed into doing more on this problem than they would otherwise have done, had Jo Rotblat not been there behind them, educating them, propelling them into the arena”

Transfer of skills, means to future policy makers
Nuclear weapons free world & aspirational goals

- 1955 Manifesto to present day
- NWFW publications
- Canberra Commission was direct outcome
- Pugwash national groups quietly helped with follow-on ‘gang of four/five’ letters
- Pugwash success - “gradually securing respectability for the goal of an international treaty on chemical weapons” (Perry Robinson)

How to measure successful transfer of an aspirational goal? What is the timeframe?
P.S. Pugwash dialogues across divides continue today

Still learning to think in a new way.
"WE MUST BE PRETTY CLOSE TO PUGWASH!"