Andrew Carnegie’s Quest for Peace
Andrew Carnegie believed in the power of international laws and organizations to stave off conflict and he trusted that future wars would be averted by mediation. He felt that war is wasteful, that diplomacy can resolve disputes without bloodshed and that nations can and should act collectively to prosecute cases of injustice when necessary. One of the first to call for the establishment of a “league of nations,” he argued that war might be eliminated if such a global organization were established with authority to settle international disputes through arbitration and the use of economic sanctions.

In 1903, Andrew Carnegie supported the founding of the Peace Palace at The Hague, which today houses the Permanent Court of Arbitration, the United Nation’s International Court of Justice, and The Hague Academy of International Law. In 1910, in an effort to “hasten the abolition of international war,” he gave $10 million to establish the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, an organization dedicated to advancing cooperation between nations. And in 1911, he established Carnegie Corporation of New York to “promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding,” a mission that was, in Carnegie’s mind, the surest path to permanent peace.

Preparing for the Breakup of the Soviet Union
In 1983, the year after David Hamburg became president of the foundation, during a period when international tensions were running high while international dialogue about how to address conflicts hardly rose above a murmur, the Corporation launched the Avoiding Nuclear War program. Taking note of the escalating dangers of confrontation between nuclear-armed nations and public discussion about the possible scenarios in which they might be used, Carnegie Corporation, under Dr. Hamburg’s guidance, decided, initially, to focus a sizeable portion of its grantmaking activities on avoiding nuclear war between the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

The Avoiding Nuclear War program was designed to help fill the gaps in knowledge about the U.S.-Soviet relationship and nuclear policy. Under the program, the Corporation provided grants related to arms control, supported cooperative U.S.-Soviet linkages and strengthened U.S. institutions working in these areas. The thrust of these grants was to revitalize the study of international security and also to promote a corpus of scholarly and intellectual analysis on nuclear issues and on U.S.-Soviet relations.

Laying the Groundwork for Nunn-Lugar
In the early 1990s with the breakup of the Soviet Union and a weaker, but a still nuclear-armed Russia emerging, Carnegie Corporation of New York initiated a number of grants to facilitate the convening of high-level experts concerned with post-Soviet nuclear nonproliferation issues. The first such effort was the Committee on Reducing the Nuclear Danger, formed at the request of Carnegie Corporation and chaired by McGeorge Bundy, a former advisor to President John F. Kennedy, Sidney Drell of New York University, and Admiral William Crowe, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The formation of a Prevention of Proliferation Task Force followed, funded through grants to the Brookings Institution. It was this task force whose report Soviet Nuclear Fission:
Control of the Nuclear Arsenal in a Disintegrating Soviet Union shook up the policy establishment with its explanation of how the Soviet Union’s system of control for its nuclear weapons—weak to begin with, and riddled with problems—could break down under political revolution, republican secession and widespread civil chaos, resulting in nuclear weapons, fissile material or nuclear know-how falling into dangerous hands. The report in turn led to the development of the landmark Soviet Nuclear Threat Reduction Act of 1991—renamed the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program in 1993 but commonly known as “Nunn-Lugar” after the bipartisan team of Democratic Senator Sam Nunn of Georgia and Republican Senator Richard Lugar of Indiana who sponsored and vigorously lobbied for the legislation—that helped to safeguard nuclear weapons in that part of the world during this dangerous time.

The Nunn-Lugar program has also facilitated several politically sensitive operations in the former Soviet Union. In 1994, Project Sapphire removed 600 kilograms of highly enriched uranium from Kazakhstan. The amount of material was sufficient to make between 20 and 30 nuclear weapons. In 1997, 21 nuclear-capable MIG-29C attack aircraft were acquired from Moldova before they could be purchased by another country. In 1998, Operation Auburn Endeavor removed 8.8 kilograms of highly enriched uranium from the former Soviet state of Georgia.

Informing the Public, Policymakers about the Nuclear Threat
During Dr. Hamburg’s presidency, which spanned the years up to 1997, the avoidance of nuclear conflict became a hallmark concern of the foundation. It was also during that period that the Corporation engaged in grantmaking directed at educating the public about the nuclear threat. For example, Corporation-supported work provided the public with expert analyses on the uses of nuclear weapons and the nature of the U.S.-Soviet relationship. A series of conferences organized by the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies brought together congressional policymakers and leading authorities on U.S.-Soviet relations and helped to build a bridge between the American public and American policymakers and the experts and scholars working on nuclear issues.

Building on Past Efforts, Refining a Program’s Focus
In an essay published in 1999, two years after he became president of Carnegie Corporation, Vartan Gregorian considered the foundation’s history, mission, and direction in light of the current world situation. Noting that two additional nations—India and Pakistan—had joined the “Nuclear Bomb Club”; that Russia, with its interlocking economic, political, military, and social crises was still in a precarious state; and that the presence and the proliferation of nuclear weapons, along with chemical and biological weapons still posed a grave threat to international peace, he wrote: “It is both logical and imperative that the Corporation continue its decade-long policy of making nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, as well as developments in Russia and other former Soviet states, central features of the International Peace and Security program. Building on our past experience in arms control and nonproliferation, the program will pay particular attention to the secure storage of nuclear weapons and weapons-grade materials and the safety of their command-and-control systems.”

The Nuclear Threat Initiative
In 2004, as part of its on-going efforts, Carnegie Corporation made an initial grant to the Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI), a nonprofit founded by philanthropist Ted Turner and
former Senator Sam Nunn. The organization serves as a catalyst for new thinking; takes direct action to reduce the threats from nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons; and works to increase public awareness on these threats and solutions to them. Since its founding, NTI has received $3.5 million in Carnegie Corporation grants since 2008, and the foundation now helps to support the organization’s Nuclear Security Project.

The mission of NTI was given a strong boost in 2007 when four prominent American statesmen—Henry Kissinger, Sam Nunn, William Perry, and George Shultz, published an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal that drew worldwide attention to the dangers of the continuing nuclear arms race and proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace: A Generation of Leadership on Nuclear Policy

In 1985, Carnegie Endowment Senior Associate Leonard “Sandy” Spector published a pioneering work called The New Nuclear Nations, which described for the first time in detail the global clandestine traffic in nuclear materials and technology.

Drawing on published sources and confidential interviews, Spector warned in particular of the efforts of a Pakistani engineer called A. Q. Khan. While the world was still focused on the nuclear arsenals of the Cold War superpowers, Spector wrote in The New Nuclear Nations that “with the spread of nuclear capabilities, the threat of nuclear terrorism also grows.” He emphasized the risk that other nations, especially in the Middle East, would be “tempted to strike pre-emptively against the nuclear installations of potential adversaries,” foreshadowing the problems that would follow the end of the Cold War.

It was twenty years before the American government openly condemned Khan’s criminal behavior under President George W. Bush. Evidence showed that Khan’s network was responsible for the export of nuclear technology to Iran, Libya, and North Korea. Spector’s prescient analysis is an impressive example of how think tanks can provide policymakers with an early warning of critical threats.

For forty years, Carnegie Endowment scholars have been at the leading edge of the debate over how to handle nuclear weapons and nuclear fuel. They have educated journalists and elected officials, mobilized the arms control and nonproliferation communities, and served in senior positions in government, where they implemented lessons learned at the Carnegie Endowment. By sustaining this commitment year after year, the Carnegie Endowment has become a major pillar of the nuclear policy community.

Building an Arms Control Community
In the early 1970s, shortly after the Carnegie Endowment returned to Washington after two decades in New York, it developed a close partnership with the newly formed Arms Control Association (ACA). For fourteen years, the Carnegie Endowment fed and nourished the ACA, providing it with a substantial portion of its operating funds as well as housing ACA staff in the Carnegie Endowment building.
As arms control became an increasingly controversial subject in the 1980s, ACA and the Carnegie Endowment staked out a strong position in favor of bilateral and multilateral negotiation as the best means of reducing the threat of nuclear weapons.

Front-Page News
On June 9, 1994, in the midst of a standoff that brought the United States to the brink of war with North Korea, Carnegie Endowment Senior Associate Selig Harrison found himself unexpectedly sitting down in Pyongyang with North Korea’s “Great Leader,” Kim II Sung, for three hours of discussion.

In 1991, the Carnegie Endowment sponsored a visit to Pyongyang by an American delegation that included Harrison, Spector, and Edward C. “Shy” Meyer, the former U.S. Army chief of staff. “We found out for the first time during our meetings that they were producing weapons-grade plutonium,” Harrison recalled.

When Harrison arrived in Pyongyang on that June 1994 visit, his hosts asked him a surprising question: would inviting former President Jimmy Carter to visit North Korea help defuse tensions with the United States?

Harrison answered in the affirmative, but never expected his hosts to extend an invitation to Carter just two days later. Carter’s own meetings with Kim led to a detailed proposal for a freeze, and within four months the United States and North Korea had signed what became known as the Agreed Framework, which stabilized U.S.-North Korean relations for several years.

In 1998, Joe Cirincione became director of the Carnegie Endowment’s nonproliferation program and launched an ambitious effort to brand the program as the authoritative source of expertise on nonproliferation. This effort focused on three channels for broadcasting the Carnegie Endowment’s research and policy proposals—building a first-class website, raising its profile in the media, and establishing its International Nuclear Policy Conference as the premier gathering of nuclear policy experts from across the globe. According to George Perkovich, the current director of the Nuclear Policy Program, “it’s often the case that folks don’t ever make it into one of the sessions that are in the meetings rooms, they’re in the hallways the entire time networking. . . . There’s nothing else like it.”

During Cirincione’s tenure, the program published two editions of Deadly Arsenals, a compendium of information and analysis that built on the precedent set by Spector’s seminal reports. Deadly Arsenals has gone on to become a staple of nuclear policy and arms control courses in universities and colleges around the world.

Nuclear Policy in the Twenty-First Century
In recent years, the Nuclear Policy Program has undertaken two global initiatives that represent significant departures from the think tank community’s standard operating procedure.

The first was the 2005 publication of Universal Compliance, a comprehensive strategy to ensure that all nations comply with “the norms and rules of a toughened nuclear nonproliferation regime.” The second was to develop a set of principles of corporate social responsibility for the multinational corporations that are the leading exporters of
nuclear power plants. Over a period of three years, exporters from Canada, China, France, Japan, Russia, South Korea, and the United States all participated in negotiating a text for their industry’s Principles of Conduct which was released in 2011.

**New START**
One of the Carnegie Endowment’s greatest successes in influencing nuclear policy was the negotiation of the New START (Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty) agreement between the United States and Russia.

From 2006 through 2008, Rose Gottemoeller served as the Carnegie Moscow Center’s director. In those years, the center became what Gottemoeller described as a “platform to plan the next stages of arms reduction” between Russia and the United States. In 2009, Gottemoeller was recruited by President Barack Obama to become assistant secretary of state for arms control, verification and compliance, where she then served as the chief negotiator of New START.

**Setting the Nuclear Policy Agenda**
The Carnegie Endowment’s work on nuclear policy and nonproliferation has spanned the entire range of activities in which a think tank or nongovernmental organization can impact policy making.

In some instances, such as Spector’s work, that impact has been through the steady dissemination of high-octane scholarship, and sometimes pointed advocacy over several years. In other instances, such as Gottemoeller’s preparatory work for New START, the efforts have translated directly into policy action.

The political and intellectual demands of a given moment may determine which of these approaches is most appropriate, but over time they reinforce each other. For four decades, the Carnegie Endowment has demonstrated a singularity of purpose and a flexibility of means in advancing the causes of arms control and nonproliferation; in doing so, it has earned itself an undisputed place at the forefront of the nuclear policy community.