



**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

June 24<sup>th</sup>, 2019

Chief Clerk Tim Sekerak:  
Please accept this vote explanation on SJM 5.

I do not speak for the Department of the Air Force or the US Government on this bill, but I do serve as a colonel in the Air National Guard, and I have served at the strategic level. Moreover, I have studied modern military history for the last quarter century. That's what I'd like to address in my vote explanation.

To be clear, I am only opposed to the provisions of the memorial relating to opposition to the modernization of our nuclear weapons. I support the remainder of the memorial, oppose any offensive use of nuclear weapons, and hope that we will eliminate nuclear weapons entirely, worldwide.

It's important to consider how we got here to consider how we might get to the point where no country has nuclear weapons. After WWII, we engaged in an escalatory cycle with the Soviet Union. As one country built more nuclear weapons, the other built to match them. We hit a peak and then began to decommission them, including with a very successful program to help retire them after the breakup of the Soviet Union. We were in a de-escalatory cycle with the end goal of zero weapons worldwide, as we had agreed to in the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, which states, "Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament." And then it stopped. We have not had a successful reduction in the number of nuclear weapons since the Putin regime came to power and the number of nuclear weapons is largely static at this point.

How are we to move forward to the goal we all want – a world with no nuclear weapons? Right now, we have a nuclear weapons program that has a number of older, more dangerous weapons that are no longer reliable. The goal of our nuclear modernization program is to create an arsenal that will be safer and more reliable and, hopefully, smaller because of it. By achieving safety and reliability, we can reduce the number of nuclear weapons necessary to counter the threats we see. When we can reduce our number, we are in a better position to ask others to reduce theirs. So, while I appreciate the efforts of the proponents to achieve the goal of zero nuclear weapons, I can't agree with the path they suggest to get there. I will be a no vote today.

Marty Wilde, State Representative, District 11

