

CIVIL SOCIETY AND
DISARMAMENT
2010



NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION
PRESENTATIONS AT THE 2010
NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION
TREATY REVIEW CONFERENCE

USD 15
ISBN 978-92-I-142277-I



Printed at the United Nations, New York

10-55552—October 2010—I,500

UNODA
United Nations Office for
Disarmament Affairs



United Nations Office for
Disarmament Affairs

CIVIL SOCIETY AND DISARMAMENT 2010

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATION
PRESENTATIONS AT THE 2010 NUCLEAR
NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY
REVIEW CONFERENCE



United Nations

Civil Society and Disarmament

This publication contains the statements by representatives of civil society organizations which were delivered on 7 May 2010 during the Non-Governmental Organization segment of the 2010 Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

The Office for Disarmament Affairs is publishing this material within the context of General Assembly resolution 63/81 on the United Nations Disarmament Information Programme in order to further an informed debate on topical issues of arms limitation, disarmament and security.

The material appearing in this publication are the views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the United Nations or its Member States.

This publication is also available at

www.un.org/disarmament

UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATION

Sales No. E.10.IX.6

ISBN 978-92-1-142277-1

Copyright © United Nations, 2010
All rights reserved
Printed in United Nations, New York

Contents

Foreword	1
I. Introduction	
<i>delivered by Ray Acheson</i>	3
II. A Nuclear Weapons Convention: The True Path to Nuclear Non-Proliferation	
<i>delivered by Jody Williams</i>	4
III. Hibakusha Statement: “Humans Cannot Coexist with Nuclear Weapons”	
<i>delivered by Taniguchi Sumiteru</i>	9
IV. Nuclear Deterrence	
<i>delivered by Rob Green</i>	13
V. Alternative Civil Society View: Nuclear Deterrence	
<i>delivered by Christopher Ford</i>	18
VI. Youth Speech	
<i>delivered by Barbara Streibl and Fatih Oezcan</i>	20
VII. The Path to a Nuclear-Free World: The Case for a Nuclear Weapons Convention	
<i>delivered by Rebecca Johnson</i>	24
VIII. Statement of Jayantha Dhanapala	33
IX. Issues Related to Nuclear Disarmament and Non-Proliferation – Part I	
<i>delivered by John Borroughs</i>	37
X. Issues Related to Nuclear Disarmament and Non-Proliferation – Part II	
<i>delivered by Jae Won Lee</i>	47
XI. Middle East Nuclear Weapon Free Zone	
<i>delivered by Holly Lindamood</i>	53

XII.	Article IV: The NPT's Fault line <i>delivered by Mary Olson</i>	57
XIII.	Statement by a meeting of non-governmental experts from countries belonging to the New Agenda Coalition <i>delivered by Amelia Broodryk</i>	66
XIV.	Religious Leaders Statement <i>delivered by Most Venerable Gijun Sugitani</i>	73
XV.	Speech by the Mayor of Hiroshima <i>delivered by Tadatoshi Akiba</i>	75
XVI.	The Mayor of Nagasaki's Statement <i>delivered by Tomihisa Taue</i>	77

Foreword

Since the first nuclear weapon test in New Mexico, USA in 1945, the vast majority of citizens around the world have called for the elimination of these weapons. Non-governmental and civil society organizations have organized rallies, demonstrations, teach-ins, and protests and have published bulletins, newsletters, books, and journals to provide information and analysis on nuclear weapon programmes and policies. Every year, many of these advocates for nuclear disarmament come to the preparatory meetings and review conferences of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) to lobby their governments for commitments to fulfill article VI of the Treaty: negotiations in good faith on nuclear disarmament and cessation of the arms race.

In 2010, in addition to the States parties and intergovernmental organizations, 1500 individuals from 121 non-governmental organizations (NGOs) from around the world attended the NPT Review Conference, held at the United Nations in New York. Participating in a process that began in November 2009, over one hundred of these representatives from NGOs came together to draft official statements, which were delivered in a formal plenary meeting to the States parties of the NPT, the United Nations Secretariat, and fellow civil society representatives. The process for drafting these statements was held online, to facilitate the participation of people working around the world. Most statements were drafted collectively. Working groups formed around particular topics and drafts were shared among all participants for further refinement.

Through this method, we jointly prepared presentations on the most critical issues on NPT States parties' agendas, including the feasibility and necessity of a nuclear weapons convention, the pursuit of a zone free of nuclear weapons in the Middle East, the challenges of nuclear energy for disarmament and non-proliferation, and realistic assessments of the current situation in disarmament and non-proliferation. The presentations highlighted the challenges we face and choices for the future, recommending a path to enhanced international and human security through disarmament. The predominant theme throughout these presentations is that if the danger of nuclear war is to be eliminated, ceasing to plan and build for an eternal nuclear

threat must come early, not late, in the process. The time for concrete nuclear disarmament and the total elimination of these weapons is now and civil society is ready to work with governments and the United Nations on achieving this goal.

Diverging opinions did exist in this process. The collectively-drafted presentation on nuclear deterrence, presented by Rob Green of the Disarmament and Security Centre in New Zealand, prompted an “alternative” presentation from Christopher Ford of the Hudson Institute, who earlier in the 2010 NPT review process represented the United States of America under the administration of President George W. Bush. Otherwise, participants in the process deliberated and compromised with each other over the content, striving to present the strongest, most coherent set of presentations possible in the three hours allotted.

This year, in addition to the collectively-drafted statements, we were also honoured to have several special guests contribute to our presentations. Nobel Peace Prize laureate Jody Williams spoke about the need and feasibility of negotiating a nuclear weapons convention. Taniguchi Sumiteru, a survivor of the US atomic bombing of Nagasaki (hibakusha), delivered a moving statement describing his experience in the bombing. He concluded that “for humans to live as humans, not even one nuclear weapon should be allowed to exist on earth.” Two youth delegates from the Ban All Nukes generation, Barbara Streibl and Fatih Oezcan, presented views and perspectives on nuclear weapons from youth around the world that they had collected in advance of the Review Conference. Jayantha Dhanapala, a former United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, called for the negotiation of a nuclear weapons convention as “the only credible alternative” to further nuclear proliferation and the modernization and life extension of existing arsenals. A group of organizations from the states that are part of the New Agenda Coalition issued a statement charting what they see as the path forward. The Most Venerable Gijun Sugitani, representing Religions for Peace, argued that “rather than ensuring security, nuclear weapons compromise security.” And Mayor Tadatoshi Akiba of Hiroshima and Mayor Tomihisa Taue of Nagasaki appealed to NPT States parties to abolish nuclear weapons in the lifetime of the remaining hibakusha.

The participants of this process—the presenters and all those who helped draft and coordinate behind the scenes—intend these presentations to provide some food for thought to delegations, media, United Nations staff, and other members of civil society. They are not meant to be lectures but the initiation of a dialogue that can continue long after the three hours in the meeting room are up. Collaboration and cooperation among governments, the United Nations, and civil society has resulted in great achievements in arms control and disarmament issues in the past. We believe there are limitless possibilities for the future.

I am grateful to the people at the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs for their continued support of NGO engagement in disarmament and arms control processes at the United Nations and thank them for publishing these presentations.

*Ray Acheson, Director of the Reaching Critical Will project
of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
New York, 8 September 2010*

PRESENTATIONS

Introduction

Drafted and delivered by Ms. Ray Acheson, Reaching Critical Will a Project of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

Ambassador Cabactulan, delegates, Secretariat, and fellow members of civil society,

Thank you for providing the opportunity for non-governmental organizations to participate in your work at this important Review Conference. We have been following the proceedings closely and holding our own educational and advocacy events. This year, 1500 individuals from 121 organizations from around the world have been accredited to attend the Conference.

The presentations you are about to hear have been in development since November 2009. Over one hundred NGO representatives have participated in the drafting of these statements through a collective process held mostly online, to facilitate the participation of people working around the world. As you can imagine, it is not an easy process—perhaps no easier than negotiating an outcome document for this Review Conference.

However, we hope the views presented here provide some food for thought in your deliberations. We always welcome feedback, questions, and comments and are happy to engage with delegates at any time. As many of you have pointed out, collaboration and cooperation between governments and civil society has resulted in great achievements on arms control and disarmament issues in the past, and we believe that there are limitless possibilities for the future.

Without further ado, I would like to invite the first speaker of our programme to take the floor, Ms. Jody Williams of the Nobel Women's Initiative, who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for her work, in just such cooperation with governments, to ban antipersonnel landmines.

Thank you.

A Nuclear Weapons Convention: The True Path to Nuclear Non-Proliferation

Drafted and delivered by Jody Williams, Chair, Nobel Women's Initiative

In October of 1986, Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev met in Reykjavik, Iceland where they seriously discussed the elimination of nuclear weapons. It was a moment of mind-boggling possibility. It was a moment of promise that could have changed our world forever. It was a moment for bold leadership. And it was a moment lost.

But I, like many, many others, believe that we are at a critical and promising moment again – perhaps we could call it a new “Reykjavik moment.” Or the “Promise of Prague.” But in either case, this is a moment of immense possibility that can and must succeed. Since those Reagan-Gorbachev talks so many years ago, the world has been charting a dangerous nuclear course. We have witnessed nuclear proliferation and the threat of more. We are now confronted with a real possibility of nuclear materials falling into the hands of armed non-state actors who would not hesitate to use them.

These new realities have been a wake up call to the world and over the past couple of years, there has been increased fervor over renewed possibilities of nuclear disarmament. In April of last year, we heard the Prague Promise of a future free of nuclear weapons. This was followed by an unprecedented meeting last September, chaired by a U.S. President at the United Nations, to discuss nuclear weapons.

Since then we have witnessed the successful conclusion of negotiations of a new START agreement between the United States and Russia, and the signing of that treaty-- again in Prague--this April. And less than a week after that, 47 heads of state met in Washington, DC for a nuclear summit in the leadup to this very important Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty now underway here in New York.

We welcome and embrace the increased attention to and talk about nuclear weapons and a world free of these unconscionable weapons of mass destruction. After all, opinion polls conducted in 21 countries in 2008 found that an estimated 76% of people around the world—including majorities in the nuclear states--support the idea of a binding, verifiable nuclear weapons convention.

If this does not demonstrate to governments that they have a clear popular mandate to begin serious negotiations now, what will it take? If the nuclear states ignore the will of the overwhelming majority of people around the world, I worry what that means for our collective future.

Since Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the people of this planet have been in thrall to those few nations who all too literally hold our very existence in their nuclear hands. There have been moments of great hope—Reykjavik—and moments of horrific fear—the Cuban Missile Crisis. After the NPT Review Conference of 2005, the nuclear future looked dismal. Now, with new possibilities again palpable, we cannot and we must not let this moment pass.

The states gathered here in New York can seize this opportunity and change our future forever. With brave vision and even bolder action, the Promise of Prague can be transformed into the reality of nuclear abolition. This will not happen with rousing rhetoric or nuclear legerdemain. This will happen with a clear and honest assessment of the progress made and the challenges remaining in the implementation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Now, some 40 years after its entry into force, are states—and the peoples of the world that they represent--satisfied that the NPT is being properly implemented and complied with? Is proliferation truly being held in check? Are the nuclear states honestly and actively working toward the elimination of their own weapons as mandated by the Treaty? If the weapons potential of nuclear power is not clearly tackled can we ever really be free of the nuclear threat?

In 1997 with successful negotiation of the Mine Ban Treaty and then again in 2008 with the Cluster Munition Convention, the world recognized that *total elimination* was the only way to ensure non-use and non-proliferation of those conventional weapons that by their very nature undeniably posed too grave a danger to civilians. Even earlier, with the Chemical Weapons Convention, states recognized that *total elimination* was the only viable approach for a weapon of mass destruction. Nuclear weapons are not—nor can they be allowed to be—the exception.

Civil society and non-governmental organizations suffer no illusion that the journey to nuclear abolition will be easy, but we do know that it must begin now. Those few who hold our collective fate in their hands must respond to the collective will of the billions they allege to protect

with nuclear weapons we do not want. It is time for all governments to come together--with the support of civil society around the world--to chart our course to a nuclear free future by beginning the negotiation of a comprehensive treaty banning the use, production, transfer and stockpiling of nuclear weapons. **Now.** Not in years or decades. **Now.**

Whenever there has been an effort to eliminate a weapon, there have been many who resisted the change. In some cases, some argued for "better regulations" to clarify the "responsible use" of a particular weapon. In others, it was argued that such negotiations were "premature" -- as some insist now in relation to a nuclear weapons convention.

The arguments against banning antipersonnel landmines, cluster bombs and chemical weapons were specious. It is specious now to maintain that it is premature to negotiate the elimination of nuclear weapons--creations of such heinous violence that they almost defy the imagination. Specious arguments can and must be challenged and overcome. Governments can change their positions seemingly in a heartbeat. Particularly in response to collective pressure by civil society. Such change has happened before and it can happen now. It is a matter of recognizing the humanitarian costs and then generating sufficient political will.

Calling for the appropriate treaty is the normal and obvious way to proceed in order to generate the necessary political will and momentum to achieve a weapons ban. After all, that is why we have a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, a Cluster Munition Convention, a Mine Ban Treaty and a Chemical Weapons Convention.

We could start now to push to eliminate nuclear weapons by outlawing their use altogether. The International Court of Justice could declare their use to be a crime against humanity. Let's not forget that the use of chemical weapons was banned before the comprehensive treaty was finally negotiated many years later. In other words, it has been done before with other weapons of mass destruction. It can be done again with nuclear weapons.

Even if begun today, the difficult and complex negotiations for a total ban of nuclear weapons would take time. Even if a Nuclear Weapons Convention were successfully negotiated in a relatively short period, the process of eliminating all the nuclear weapons in the world today would take time. And the world does not have the luxury of too much more time.

Charting this new course could be undertaken by like-minded states or by the United Nations General Assembly – or it could be launched here and now out of this NPT Review Conference. States could begin the process of negotiating a nuclear weapons convention now. After all, it certainly is not a new idea. Nor is it the simply the “noise” generated by civil society and non-governmental organizations.

United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon included a call for a nuclear weapons convention in the first point of his five-point plan on nuclear disarmament, in which he urged all states to fulfill their longstanding obligation to disarm. Each year, more than 120 states in the United Nations General Assembly vote in favor of a resolution on the illegality of nuclear weapons which calls for the commencement of negotiations leading to the early conclusion of a nuclear weapons convention.

The beginning of a process to ban nuclear weapons does not mean that other measures would be neglected. Over the lengthy period of negotiation of the Chemical Weapons Convention, for example, the United States and Russia also bilaterally negotiated concerning their large stockpiles. Preparation for, and negotiation of, a nuclear weapons convention can proceed in parallel with, and inform and stimulate, negotiation and implementation of other measures.

In closing, I must strongly underscore again that the seemingly impossible can happen. But it will take a global partnership. It will take the determination and commitment of governments, United Nations agencies and civil society alike. But it can be done. It must be done. The experiences of the earlier ban conventions are instructive. The International Campaign to Ban Landmines was successful beyond our wildest expectations. In fact, among my very first trips to promote the Campaign, I came here to New York to try to talk with governments about banning antipersonnel landmines. In those days, I was lucky if anyone at an Embassy would even answer my calls. It seemed a cold and unforgiving world.

But we took an issue that at the time was called a “utopian dream” and with commitment and determination and true grit created enough political pressure around the world to get governments to begin to take unilateral steps to deal with the landmine problem. Those individual state actions provided the necessary momentum to build sufficient political will so that governments that believed in the ban and civil society

Disarmament and Civil Society

organizations became strong partners in the process that gave the world the Mine Ban Treaty. A very similar process resulted in the Convention on Cluster Munitions.

That work has been called “micro-disarmament” by some, and not always as a compliment. There is absolutely no question that abolishing nuclear weapons is a far more daunting enterprise. Yet a nuclear free world is **not** an impossible goal. It is **not** the utopian dream of those who do not understand the harsh realities of the world. In fact, we understand those realities all too well – which is why we want a nuclear weapons convention now.

We listen to the survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and can picture a horror that no human being should ever have to suffer again. We think about continued nuclear proliferation and the fear and instability that such proliferation foretells. The all-too-real possibility of armed non-state actors getting their hands on nuclear weapons and using them is nothing but terrifying. But “nuclear deterrence” surely does not underpin their strategies.

These scenarios are not the wild thinking of fuzzy headed peaceniks contemplating futures full of beautiful rainbows and peace doves all the while trying to conjure them up while singing “Kumbaya.” They are the stark and clear-headed understanding of the nuclear state of play in the world today. They are extremely harsh realities that we are determined to overcome with the total elimination of the use, production, trade and stockpiling of nuclear weapons. Civil society will work in open partnership—as we did in the landmine and cluster munition ban movements—with states that show real and daring leadership by launching a process now to begin the difficult work of negotiating a Nuclear Weapons Convention.

The Reykjavik moment was lost – at our peril. We cannot squander the promise of the past few years. We must not squander the Promise of Prague. We do not have the luxury of time. The world cannot wait for change. It must come now. And each and every one of us has a part to play in transforming the possibility of a **nuclear-free world** into reality **now**. Not eventually, but **now**.

Thank you.

Hibakusha Statement: “Humans Cannot Coexist with Nuclear Weapons”

Drafted and delivered by Taniguchi Sumiteru, Japan Confederation of A-and H-Bomb Sufferers Organizations (Nihon Hidankyo)

Chairperson, distinguished delegates and dear friends,

I am Taniguchi Sumiteru, a Nagasaki *Hibakusha*. Thank you very much for giving me the honor of speaking before you on behalf of the 230,000 Japanese A-bomb survivors, and peace-loving NGOs of the world.

In 1945, I was 16 years old. On the morning of August 9, I was riding my bicycle 1.8 kilometers north of what was to become the epicenter of the explosion of the atomic bomb. When the bomb exploded, I was burned on my entire back by the intense heat rays of 3,000 to 4,000 degrees Celsius, and also exposed to invisible radiation. The next moment, together with my bike I was blown about 4 meters and smashed to the ground by the bomb blast.

When the blast ended, I looked up and found that the buildings around me had been smashed down and those children who had been playing around me were blown away and scattered here and there. I was struck by the fear of death, thinking that a big bomb had been dropped nearby. But I kept telling myself that I must not die like this.

When the commotion seemed to be over, I raised myself and found my entire left arm had been burnt with the skin hanging from it like a tattered rag. I reached for my back and found that it too had been burnt. Something slimy and black stuck on my fingers.

My bike was bent and twisted completely out of shape - the body, the wheels and all. Houses were all flattened. Fires were breaking out from these houses and from the trees on the hillside. The children that had been blown away were all dead: some were burnt black, while others seemed uninjured.

There was a woman whose hair was all burned and lost. Her face was so swollen that she could not open her eyes. She was injured from head to toe and groaning in pain. I still recall the scene as if I saw it only yesterday. I deeply regret even today that I could not do anything for

those who were suffering and desperately calling for help. Many *hibakusha* were severely burnt and died calling for water.

I wandered around like a sleepwalker and reached a nearby factory set up in a hillside tunnel. I asked a woman to tear off the burnt skin dangling from my arms. She tore a piece of cloth out of what was left of my shirt, put machine oil to it and wiped my arms. Together with other people, I was told to evacuate somewhere else from the tunnel before another possible strike. I tried with all my strength but I couldn't even get up, let alone walk. A man carried me on his back to the top of a mountain and laid me down under a tree. Many people around me, before they breathed their last, asked other people there to remember their names and home addresses to their family members. They died one after another, crying, "Water, give me water...". When the night came, U.S. aircraft flew over and attacked us. Some stray bullets hit the rock next to me and fell on the grass.

At night there was a drizzling rain. I sucked the water dripping from the leaves and spent the night. When the morning came, I found all who were around me were already dead. I spent another night there and in the morning of the third day was rescued and taken to the neighboring city 27 kilometers from Nagasaki. By that time, the city's hospitals were all full of victims, so I was taken to an elementary school, which had been turned into a makeshift clinic.

Three days later (the 6th day from the bombing) my wounds started to bleed heavily and with it, gradually I started to feel the pain. For more than a month I could not receive any proper medical treatment. All they could do to me was to burn newspapers, blend their ash with oil and apply it to my wound. In early September the Nagasaki University hospital managed to restart its operation at an elementary school in Nagasaki City, though the school building had no windows due to the bomb blast. I was sent there and for the first time I received what could be called medical treatment. First, doctors tried to give me a blood transfusion. But the blood wouldn't go into my vessels, probably because my internal organs were badly damaged. I suffered serious anemia and the burnt flesh started to rot. The rotten flesh would drain out of my body and puddle underneath. Nurses placed rugs underneath my body to collect the filthy discharges and replaced them many times a day.

Generally those *hibakusha* who suffered burns or injuries were infested with maggots on their flesh. Those tiny worms got into their bodies from the wounds and ate their flesh. But for me this did not happen until one year later. It was so unbearably painful when they bit my wounds.

I could not stir an inch. Helplessly lying on my stomach in excruciating pain and agony I was crying, "Kill me!" No one believed that I would survive another day. Every morning, I would hear doctors and nurses whisper at my bedside, "He's still alive." Later I learned that my family was all prepared for my funeral.

Because I could not move myself, my chest suffered severe bedsores even to the bones. As a result my chest now looks like it has been deeply scooped, and even today you can clearly see my heart beating against the skin between the ribs.

It took one year and 9 months before I was finally able to move, and after 3 years and 7 months I was discharged from the hospital, though I was not completely cured. I went in and out of the hospital many times and continued having treatment until 1960. Around 1982 tumors started to develop on the keloid scars on my back and they had to be removed by surgery. Since then a rock-hard tumor was formed again and again, the cause of which even doctors are unable to explain.

More than half a century has passed since that day. The painful experiences of the past seem to be lost from people's memory. But I fear the oblivion. I fear that forgotten memories might lead us to a renewed affirmation of atomic bombs.

There is a color film on the atomic bombings that contains the footage of myself as one of numerous victims. Whenever I see it I relive the pain and feel the hatred for war growing inside me again.

I am not a guinea pig nor am I an exhibit. But those of you who are here today, please don't turn your eyes away from me. Please look at me again. I have survived miraculously, but for me, to "live" was to "endure the agony." The atomic bomb survivors, who reached the maximum number of 380,000 at one time, have now decreased to 230,000. Bearing the cursed scars of the atomic bomb all over our bodies, we the *Hibakusha* continue to live in pain.

Disarmament and Civil Society

Nuclear weapons are weapons of extinction that cannot coexist with humans. They should never, ever be used for any reason whatsoever. Possession of nuclear weapons, or even an intention to acquire them, is against humanity. Having gone through the first hell of nuclear war in August 65 years ago, we learned the horror of nuclear weapons instinctively. There is no defense against nuclear attacks, and there can be no “retaliation” against them. If a nuclear weapon is to be used for the third time, it would immediately lead to the annihilation of human beings and the end of all life on planet earth. Humans must survive - in peace and prosperity.

So friends, let all of us unite and gather our strength to create a world without nuclear weapons. For humans to live as humans, not even one nuclear weapon should be allowed to exist on earth.

I cannot die in peace until I witness the last nuclear warhead eliminated from this world.

Nagasaki must remain the last victim city of the atomic bomb.

And let me be the last victim of the atomic bomb.

Let us spread our call for the abolition of nuclear weapons all over the world.

No More Hiroshimas! No More Nagasakis!

No More *Hibakusha*!

Nuclear Deterrence

Drafted by Rob Green, Disarmament and Security Centre; Kate Dewes, Disarmament and Security Centre; Rebecca Johnson, Acronym Institute for Disarmament Diplomacy; Martin Butcher; John Burroughs, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy; Jacqueline Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation; Chuck Baynton, Wisconsin Network for Peace and Justice; Regina Hagen, International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation; Susi Snyder, IKV Pax Christi

Mr. President, Ambassadors, delegates and friends of the NGOs,

In the NGO presentation on this issue at last year's PrepCom, it was stated that nuclear deterrence is the largest obstacle to a nuclear weapon-free world. We endorse this, but go further: we have concluded that nuclear deterrence doctrine is a potentially terminal delusion that needs to be challenged head-on because it is the final justification for never getting rid of nuclear arsenals. If we are right, then all that is preventing rapid progress in complying with Article VI of the NPT is a terrible, naïve misunderstanding associated with hitherto unquestioned acceptance about what nuclear weapons are supposed to do. This issue is one of the most urgent that we need to address now because, as Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon rightly observed on United Nations Day 2008, "the doctrine of nuclear deterrence has proven to be contagious." This needs an immunization programme which persuades security planners that nuclear deterrence is irrational and unacceptable.

Exploited by those with a vested interest in retaining nuclear weapons, nuclear deterrence runs counter to military experience and behavioural analysis. Yet they insist that, because the technologies to make such weapons cannot be disinvented, nuclear deterrence must remain in security doctrines. Even in a nuclear weapon-free world, they argue, the ability to build nuclear weapons must be retained as a "virtual deterrent" against breakout.

Such justifications are rejected by the overwhelming majority of NGOs and security analysts, who believe that nuclear deterrence doctrines have a fundamental and insoluble problem of credibility and logic. The belief in nuclear deterrence is based upon the crazy premise that nuclear war can be made less probable by deploying weapons and doctrines that make it more probable. Specifically, it is impossible for a rational leader to make a credible nuclear threat when directed against

a nuclear adversary capable of a retaliatory second strike. And a second strike is pointless, because it would be no more than posthumous revenge, in which millions of innocent people would die horribly. This is why enthusiasm for a nuclear-weapon-free world is incompatible with “we will keep nuclear weapons for deterrence as long as anyone else has them.” We commend the recently published US Nuclear Posture Review for narrowing options for use of nuclear weapons by restoring assurances of non-use against non-nuclear weapon members of the NPT. However, this core contradiction remains, undermining President Obama’s efforts to reduce the salience of nuclear weapons.

Once again, we see how nuclear armed states resist giving up their nuclear arsenals because of the prevailing belief that nuclear weapons provide an ultimate security guarantee and privileged status. This provokes proliferation. Nuclear deterrence, like all theories, is not foolproof. It entails a hostile stand-off, relying on rational actors with similar values and perfect communications, who in the case of the United States and Russia have less than half an hour to assess a possible attack and decide what to do. Furthermore, such hostile posturing can result in deterrence being misinterpreted as provocation.

The administration of George W. Bush was the first among the nuclear weapon states to recognise publicly that nuclear deterrence would not work against terrorists. What was not admitted is that nuclear weapons are not weapons at all. The uniquely indiscriminate, long-term effects of radioactivity, including genetic and environmental damage, on top of almost unimaginable explosive violence, make them the most unacceptable terror device yet invented – far worse than chemical or even biological weapons, with which they are deliberately linked by some policy-makers. Relying on threats to use them, therefore, amounts to state-sponsored nuclear terrorism. Yet every nuclear weapon state contemplates modernizing, if not increasing, its arsenal.

Extremists driven by religious or political ideologies would not only not be deterred by nuclear weapons. Their game plan could include provoking nuclear retaliation in order to turn moral outrage against the retaliator and recruit more people to their nightmarish causes. Also, some nuclear-armed states are threatening nuclear retaliation against even cyberwarfare. Where would the nuclear strikes be targeted? Hackers

– individuals or governments – cannot necessarily be identified as to location or nationality.

Some allies of the nuclear weapon states are re-assessing the value of extended nuclear deterrence. In our view, extended nuclear deterrence is unnecessary and counterproductive for security. First, the nuclear states risk being pushed into first use of nuclear weapons when their own security is not directly threatened. Secondly, the misnamed “nuclear umbrella” could become a lightning rod for insecurity because of the high risk of rapid, uncontrollable escalation to full-scale nuclear war. Even limited use could also magnify catastrophic climate change, causing widespread famine for millions.

A significant parliamentarians’ group from the new Japanese government seeks real security by promoting a Nuclear Weapon Free Zone covering the Korean Peninsula and Japan, as an important step towards further confidence-building in the region. This would prevent a regional nuclear arms race between Japan, South Korea and North Korea, or between Japan and a reunified Korea. Such an arrangement would be in the interests of the US, Russia and China. It would be a powerful way to ease tension and enhance security by hastening the peaceful reunification of the two Koreas and promoting co-operative security in Northeast Asia.

Meanwhile, NATO is under pressure to review its nuclear doctrine as five member states call for US tactical nuclear weapons to be removed from Europe as a confidence-building measure with Russia. Further steps towards effective Negative Security Assurances would include a protocol to the NPT, signed by all the nuclear weapon states, undertaking not to attack non-nuclear signatory states, plus all the P-5 ratifying the NSA protocols in nuclear weapon free zone treaties. The nub of the moral case against nuclear deterrence is that no state has the right to seek security by threatening, through collateral damage, to destroy potentially all civilization and the entire ecosystem of the planet. Nuclear deterrence doctrine has always entailed an intention to attack cities with nuclear terror devices, knowingly causing monstrous atrocities. The moral deception deepens when the nuclear weapon states, having admitted that extremists armed with weapons of mass destruction cannot be deterred, plan pre-emptive nuclear attacks in ‘anticipatory self-defence’ of their ‘vital interests’ – not last-ditch defence of their home territory. Thereby, their

unprovable claim that nuclear deterrence averts war is cynically stood on its head.

In its 1996 Advisory Opinion, the International Court of Justice in effect outlawed nuclear deterrence when it unanimously confirmed that the threat or use of nuclear weapons would generally be illegal. It stated:

‘If the envisaged use of force is itself unlawful, the stated readiness to use it would be a threat prohibited under [United Nations Charter] Article 2, paragraph 4. Thus it would be illegal for a State to threaten force to secure territory from another State, or to cause it to follow or not follow certain political or economic paths. The notions of “threat” and “use” of force under Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter stand together in the sense that if the use of force itself in a given case is illegal – for whatever reason – the threat to use such force will likewise be illegal.’

The Court did not sanction any use of nuclear weapons.

Nuclear deterrence mantras provide no more than a psychological security blanket, a grown-up version of the bit of ragged cloth that some children turn to alone at night or when times are stressful. Most children grow up enough to leave it behind. Another variant is that nuclear deterrence is described as ‘the ultimate insurance’. Insurance policies do not prevent disasters or make them go away; but they might (depending on the small print) help a policy-holder recover from some of the damage if disaster strikes. However, likening nuclear deterrence to insurance ignores the opportunity costs in terms of other defence and security resources, and that in order to be credible, nuclear weapons must be deployed ready for attack. Such deployment sustains an atmosphere of distrust and hostility, increasing potential threats and dangers – especially with associated risks of false warning, miscalculation and accident. It also assumes a reasonable ratio between the costs and benefits of the chosen insurance, and glosses over the terrible, uninsurable costs if the relied-upon but oxymoronic ‘nuclear deterrent’ fails and nuclear weapons are launched. What is more, at least some of the long-term environmental costs would be incurred not by just the nuclear adversaries, but over time by the entire international community and all life on the planet.

Sixty-five years after Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and over twenty years after the Cold War ended, we need to have the courage and wisdom to discard that security blanket, and strip away the deceits of nuclear deterrence. If the political and military leaders of the nuclear weapon

NGO presentations at the 2010 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference

states and their allies cannot think their way beyond the circular logic, myths and misleading promises of nuclear deterrence, then it is up to responsible, conscientious citizens to call their bluff and demand more humane, lawful and safer non-nuclear – and preferably non-violent – security strategies. As with the abolition of slavery, we need to generate unstoppable political will in support of the United Nations Secretary-General's courageous plan to remove and dismantle the scourge of nuclear weapons under a Nuclear Weapons Convention, so that the world is not destroyed if – when – deterrence fails.

Alternative Civil Society View: Nuclear Deterrence

Delivered and prepared by Christopher Ford, Hudson Institute

Mr. President, Ambassadors, delegates, and friends of the NGOs, you have heard much about disarmament from NGOs here today. I am glad to be able to speak to the subject too, however, lest you get the false impression that what you have heard so far represents the views of all civil society. Fortunately, it does not.

To hear some tell it, nuclear deterrence is a terrible travesty – at best a naïve mistake, and really more akin to criminal insanity. Anyone who insists upon a such starting assumption, however, is not interested in a meaningful or constructive dialogue with nuclear weapons possessors and indeed many *other* countries in the present international system – and will thus continue to pass up opportunities to make progress in reducing reliance upon nuclear weapons, the numbers of them in existence, and the risks they present.

Simply put, the problem is that nuclear deterrence *isn't* stupid or insane, and it is an important part of the security planning of numerous governments. Nuclear weapons possessors think nuclear deterrence is viable and necessary; many of their allies rely upon such deterrence in “extended” form; other countries clearly *seek* nuclear weapons on the basis of what they claim, at least, is some need to deter others. Remarkably few, if any, appear to think it *irrelevant*, much less insane.

Still more removed are we from a world in which “deterrence” *per se* is no longer a factor in security planning. *That* world, indeed, is scarcely imaginable at all. One might as well plan for the abolition of locks, car alarms, and police constables. Deterrence *as a phenomenon* cannot be declared away, and it is simply a fact of life that one can indeed often prevent someone from taking some action by making clear that its cost will be unacceptable and outweigh any benefit. The challenge for the disarmament community, therefore, is not to reject the possibility of deterrence in its *nuclear* form but rather to understand and work to lessen reliance upon it. If my colleagues were right that nuclear deterrence is simply lunacy, disarmament wouldn't be so hard: most governments aren't led by lunatics. But it takes clear thinking and sustained effort replace sane and well-established traditions of relying upon nuclear weapons with intelligible and credible *alternatives*. How tragic it would

be for ideological blinkers to preclude the kind of engagement needed to replace nuclear deterrence by such alternatives.

Deterrence in its most basic form is as old as one human's capability of harming another, and will not disappear even with the abolition of nuclear weaponry. Moreover, because knowledge of the possibility of nuclear arms – and basic information about how to fabricate them – cannot be erased from human memory, and because nuclear materials and the technologies for producing them remain dangerously widespread, at least *some* form even of *nuclear* deterrence is likely to remain viable even were we to achieve abolition. As long as anyone has the “option” of weapons development afforded by the possession of fissile material and dual-use technology, “nuclear deterrence” will not wholly have disappeared.

What we are talking about, therefore – or what we *should* be talking about if disarmament politics and ideology permit us such honesty – is the challenge of shaping the future security environment in ways that make it progressively more unnecessary and unwise to rely upon nuclear weapons for deterrence.

We will never able to escape deterrence *as a phenomenon*, nor probably even that oblique form of *nuclear* deterrence inherent in the continued existence of nuclear technology and material – that is, the technical availability of some weapons “option.”

But there is no law of nature that requires the actual existence of nuclear weapons; that is a policy choice. It is our challenge to make *un*-choosing that choice more of a viable option for national leaders in the real world. To do this, however, we must remember that we *are* talking about the real world, and not some fantasy kingdom in which knowledge can be decreed away and human nature reshaped at our caprice. Our task is not entirely hopeless, but we do ourselves no favor by pretending it is different than it is.

Youth Speech

Delivered by Barbara Streibl and Fatih Oezcan; coordinated by Ban All Nukes generation

Ambassador Cabactulan, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen,

Today at this historic NPT conference more youth are present than ever before. We came from all over the world to this year's Review Conference with a great notion of hope. This is a message we want to spread and gain momentum. We believe it is crucial that this positive and enthusiastic atmosphere will be maintained and transformed into a positive outcome.

At this Conference we discuss disarmament, defence, deterrence, non-proliferation, sovereignty, security doctrines, technical issues and more. The main reason we pursue these negotiations is our common objective of security. At the heart of this security, which our governments work so hard to protect, is something even more important: life. We must ask ourselves: How can we best preserve and protect all life on this planet? What do we need to ensure the true fulfilment of the human rights our governments have committed themselves to?

We would like to give you an impression of what we are talking about when we talk about life. Life is what matters. Our families and friends should be our motivation to abolish a weapon that could destroy their lives. We asked young people from around the world what they love in their lives. Today we have the pleasure to present you some of their answers.

I love going to my football academy and scoring goals, I love my family and having dinner with them, and many more things. – Ishaan Jha, 15 years from India

I love my family. No matter what happens, they love me for nothing and I feel a special bond between us. I love them as well as I thank them. – Sumi Iyo, 25 years from Japan

I love to cut, to glue and to draw. I love making things for my mum. – Gianna Sauer, 4 years from Germany

What type of security do we need, to ensure the ultimate aim: preserving life? We know the question of security is difficult, there is a multitude of factors to consider; however, one thing is clear: nuclear weapons are not the answer to our problems. Their indiscriminate nature goes against the progress that has been made in the implementation of international human rights over the course of the previous century. All people are entitled to the right to life, and no nation can define others as unworthy of this right. By maintaining nuclear weapons, states have the ability to indiscriminately kill whole populations of peoples and render the environment uninhabitable for generations to come. In signing the United Nations Charter, states committed themselves “to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world’s human and economic resources”. Nuclear weapons provide none of this.

Today, the money, technology and human intelligence that is being devoted to these instruments of death, could instead be devoted to the preservation of life. With other, more viable alternatives we don’t see any need for any country in this world to maintain nuclear arsenals, to stick to nuclear weapons and nuclear power plants, to invest in arms and create toxic, radioactive waste, targets for terrorists and increase the risk of proliferation. A safer world and one without nuclear weapons must reflect the principles of “our common future” and “our shared security”, a security that benefits every human being. Governments need to invest in human security by ensuring enough clean drinking water, sufficient food and access to necessary medical care.

The world I want to live in is a world in which the countries of the global north will look at those of the global south as friends and partners who are deserving help. We need to gain mutual benefit and work together removing all that threatens future generations. In the very least it is the kind of world I want my children to inherit. - Agyeno Ehase, 27 years from Nigeria

As human beings we have the ability to be creative, so let’s not use our ability to destroy the world. - Suzy Elwakeel, 26 years from Sudan

“Save the earth, it’s our only source of chocolate!” It’s a quote which can seem trivial, but it’s true! We always speak about petrol which is running out, but we don’t mind about what will be of us when many little things which seem insignificant will disappear... flowers, insects, chocolate... Let’s think about it! - Marie Orset, 20 years from France

Disarmament and Civil Society

Our generation was born after the Cold War. We had nothing to do with the creation and proliferation of these weapons. The Cold war is over and humanity is facing new problems. These 21st century problems cannot be solved by 20th century weapons. We are young and we have new ideas. We are growing up in a globalized world, where modern communication and technology connects so many of us. Today young people have friends all around the world. People in other countries are no longer distant and strange enemies to us. We speak to them every day. Therefore we are able to build trust. We do not have to fear foreign cultures and religions. Weapons are not protecting us from potential enemies - they are creating them. But communication gives us the ability to bring down borders. Nuclear weapons are now 65 years old. Don't you think it's time for compulsory retirement?

I love that the Dutch youth and a lot of European youth have the privilege not to have experienced war. Wouldn't it be great if that remains that way and will be established for everybody? – Franka, 26 years and Welmoed, 27 years from the Netherlands

More than anything in my life I love those brief encounters with strangers that make me feel we are all in this together. – Kirsten Stromme, 23 years from Norway

For me it is important that my family and I have a safe future in a secure country. – Elena Sipachova, 21 years from Belarus

The stability and security promised us by nuclear weapons is simply a façade behind which the awful truth resides. We, the young generation, have the courage to speak and act on the truth. The truth about the terrible effects of nuclear weapons, about the unacceptable and incalculable consequences of the future use of nuclear weapons, and the huge waste of human and financial resources, the harm to human beings, plants, animals and habitats, their contribution to the problem of climate change; and their potential to cause irreversible damage to all of us and future generations. We ask diplomats, experts, members of armed forces, public officials, and civil society, to have courage and to act on the truth.

U.S. President Obama has pointed to the desired goal at the horizon: a world free of nuclear weapons. Now is the time to make concrete steps. We call on all nuclear capable states to commit themselves to the goal

of Global Zero. We have to abolish the threat of causing a humanitarian and environmental catastrophe in less than half an hour. The time to start serious negotiations on a framework of agreements banning nuclear-weapons must be taken these weeks here in New York. The ultimate goal must be a world where nuclear weapons are illegal and no longer exist. The way to reach this goal is a Nuclear Weapons Convention.

Each year since 2005 we have stood here in front of you, asking and pleading for you to be reasonable and to think about our future, and not to leave us the legacy of fear, threats and death. We have seen no real actions or courageous leadership. So today, we ask once more for all states to begin real, honest and fruitful negotiations leading to a nuclear-weapon-free world. We do not want our governments to be in constantly hostile postures. We, the youth and we, the people want you to take us into account when you plan our future.

We must remember that the decisions taken this month do not only have an impact on us, but on the future of your children, the future of our children and grandchildren. Now this is what counts and why it is up to all of us, to change hope into reality.

We thank you for your attention. And we and all future generations will thank you for abolishing nuclear weapons.

The Path to a Nuclear-Free World: The Case for a Nuclear Weapons Convention

*Delivered by Rebecca Johnson, Acronym Institute for Disarmament Diplomacy;
Drafted by Rebecca Johnson, Acronym Institute for Disarmament Diplomacy and
John Loretz, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, with input
from Juergen Scheffran; Peter Weiss, International Association of Lawyers Against
Nuclear Arms; John Burroughs, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy; Regina Hagen,
International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation; and Alice Slater,
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation*

Mr. President, Your Excellencies, Distinguished Delegates and
Colleagues,

In their second Wall Street Journal article of January 2008, Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, Sam Nunn and William Perry liken the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons to “the top of a very tall mountain”. They see it as desirable and recognise the necessity of climbing to higher ground as there are too many dangers inherent in either staying where we are or, worse still, sliding back down into proliferation chaos. But to them, the goal and the route to get there are both out of sight. We agree that the dangers of clinging to the status quo are far greater than the challenges of climbing towards disarmament, but we think humanity is closer to achieving the summit than the cold warriors have realised.

In fact, we are so confident that the objective of a nuclear-weapons-free world is reachable in our lifetimes (and many of us are older than President Obama!) that we can envision ourselves at the summit, looking back at the path we took to get here, and realizing that the difficulties, while formidable, were overcome with persistence, creative problem solving, and flexibility to find different ways when paths we were following became obstructed.

There are better ways than carrying on up the steps bequeathed by the old map of cold war arms control and non-proliferation in isolation from disarmament. The security environment is changing, the cold war fogs are clearing, and we should recognise that where we reach in 2010 will give us the vantage point from which to survey the options and determine the optimum route to bring us to the goal in a safe, secure and timely manner. On any such journey, we are likely to encounter obstacles and perils along the way. A prevailing belief in nuclear weapons for deterrence is one such near-term obstacle. Reducing the role and value

accorded to nuclear weapons in military doctrines and security policies are therefore essential measures to take now. We are helped by the knowledge that a world without nuclear weapons must be a safer place than the one we inhabit now, not least because a single mistake with nuclear weapons could prove uniquely catastrophic. We're human, so mistakes happen – made by militaries and political leaders as well as by the rest of us.

Nuclear weapons emerged out of the bloodiest century in human history, during which almost every part of the world suffered wars driven by nationalism, greed for resources or land, and fear or hatred of other people. These conflicts have often been framed in terms of clashing religions or cultures. They have been carried forward with distorted notions of power and the masculine fighting role, fuelled by arms manufacturers and pushers of guns, bombs, and destructive arms of all kinds. Abolishing nuclear weapons will not of itself solve these problems, and human security requires that we reduce reliance on other weapons, too. We have to move away from old patterns of aggressive national security approaches and build better tools for collective human security, including “soft power” means of cooperative humanitarian engagement.

Solving these endemic security problems, which have haunted human history, cannot and must not be a precondition for nuclear disarmament. As President John F. Kennedy told the United Nations General Assembly in 1961, it is simply not credible to “maintain that disarmament must await the settlement of all disputes” or that “the quest for disarmament is a sign of weakness”. At the same time, it is clear that solving the political, technical and security challenges of abolishing nuclear arms will be made more difficult if some countries seek to control, manage or terrorise others with space-based technologies or conventional arsenals with mass destructive capabilities. Too often governments agree to ban a weapon only when they have created something to do the same military job more cheaply, destructively or efficiently. Challenging and overcoming such a mindset will have to be part of the negotiating process. But if we postpone the elimination of nuclear weapons until the world has achieved some ideal threshold of peace and stability, we will get neither disarmament nor security. If we get to work now on eradicating these uniquely powerful, indiscriminate and inhumane weapons, other changes will inevitably be part of the process. The nuclear-free world is not going to be today's world minus atomic weapons. Abolishing war is an even

higher mountain top, and will require a lot more climbing for the human race; but at least we will have reached the point of avoiding radioactive catastrophe and we will be able to make paths towards reducing conflict and enhancing human security, which includes tackling climate chaos and avoiding environmental disaster. A world without nuclear weapons will make a good base camp for continuing the climb.

This is how we should understand Article VI's ultimate injunction to pursue general and complete disarmament: not that there must be complete global disarmament before the nuclear arsenals can be eliminated, as some of the nuclear-weapon states seem to assert, but that in moving towards the abolition of nuclear weapons we need to tackle the causes of instability and insecurity, including coercive military force and the possession, trafficking and use of other types of weapons.

Negotiations on the reduction and elimination of nuclear arsenals are not discretionary; they are required by Article VI, which mandates that the negotiations are to be conducted in good faith and in accordance with international law. And they must be brought to conclusion, as the International Court of Justice unanimously advised.

As any climber will tell you, the destination and the journey are equally important. Nuclear disarmament is both a destination and a process; and a multilateral treaty – some kind of framework or comprehensive nuclear weapons convention that will codify in law and practice both the prohibition of the acquisition and use of nuclear weapons and also the safe and secure elimination of existing arsenals – has aspects of both. Getting to the right destination will require paying careful attention to the verifiable dismantlement and elimination of the existing warheads and delivery vehicles and to making sure the fissile materials and other components are disposed of or stored so that they cannot be stolen, reacquired or used for weapons in the future. All this must be done in ways that minimize the hazards for the environment and our health, and provide confidence against cheating, break-out and the acquisition of nuclear weapon capabilities by terrorist governments or actors in the future.

At the 2009 PrepCom for this Review Conference, we recommended to you that a Nuclear Weapons Convention negotiated in good faith by the international community is “required to achieve the nuclear-weapons-free world envisioned by the NPT.” Achievement of such a treaty remains the central aim, and a key rallying point, of most international

NGOs working in this field, and we are pleased to report to you today that support for such a Convention is growing around the world, and we thank those of you that have come to this Review prepared to discuss the merits of a comprehensive framework for nuclear disarmament and to set out – together with your citizens and international civil society – on this difficult but necessary trek to the top of the mountain.

As noted by Secretary General Ban Ki-moon, the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention submitted to you in 2007 is “a good point of departure”. This draft, initiated more than 15 years ago by civil society scientists, lawyers and practitioners, was developed as a resource, in the knowledge that once real negotiations begin, the multilateral outcome could look quite different. Recent treaty-making history shows that civil society participation will be essential for the success of such negotiations, and we are prepared to support you with our expertise and experience, and to urge you on when the road gets rough. The 1997 NGO model draft, updated and published as “Securing our Survival” in 2007, gives a careful and thought-provoking overview of the issues that will help as they come to be addressed in actual negotiations.

The challenge for us today is to get started on this process to achieve “the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons” that President Obama and many others have called for. One way is for a group of nations and representative experts to come together and work out the practical and diplomatic means to prepare the way for negotiating a nuclear weapons convention. Such discussions are already happening in capitals and in the margins of meetings at the United Nations in Geneva, New York, Vienna and around the world. NGOs have been meeting with their governments to hold informal dialogues about the merits of a convention, and are finding increasing levels of interest in and support for the substantive ideas contained in the Model NWC and other thoughtful analyses.

These preliminary discussions, which we urge you to continue and refine at this Review Conference, will help assess the pros and cons of existing negotiating fora and other options for convening negotiations. Development of a fast track process would come next, with preparations structured so as to draw all the nuclear-armed states – non-NPT as well as the P-5 – into negotiations sooner rather than later. Sometimes – as when the Partial Test Ban Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty,

and even the NPT were negotiated – it is necessary to get started without all the relevant states on board. Experience suggests that once the process starts, most if not all the hold-out states decide to join negotiations before the endgame. And once the treaty is signed – even before it fully enters into force -- its normative and legal impact will be to constrain everyone, whether they have formally acceded or not. While the non-nuclear-weapon states will no doubt provide early leadership, we hope that one or more nuclear-armed states will see the writing on the wall and join the driving group early in the process. President Obama has said he wants to provide such leadership, and we continue to hope that Britain will decide to ditch the expensive mistake of Trident replacement, for which the UK has to rely on the United States, fulfil its pledge to be a “disarmament laboratory”, and contribute its skills and expertise to making the nuclear-free world a reality. China, India and Pakistan have all voted in favour of a nuclear weapons convention in the General Assembly, so we look to them too to walk the walk as well as talking the talk.

Judging from their nuclear doctrines and statements, France and Russia currently appear the least likely to join a leadership group, but no one should forget how the Russian and French Presidents were the first to declare moratoria on nuclear testing in 1991 and 1992, thereby paving the way for CTBT negotiations! As for Israel... a nuclear-free Middle East would serve the interests of that conflict-ridden part of our planet, and working towards this regional objective will be mutually reinforcing as we also work for a nuclear-free world.

In history, a shock, crisis or significant political event has often provided the stepping stone for change. The 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, for example, influenced the United States, the Soviet Union and Britain to finalise a Partial Test Ban Treaty and paved the way for the NPT. Undoubtedly, the use of a nuclear weapon somewhere in the world would provide a terrible shock and, if it did not escalate into nuclear war, could lead swiftly to global disarmament – but at what an appalling cost for the victims and for the world. Far better to create a responsible political shift now, before there is any further nuclear use or accident.

It may be that there are different paths that can get us to the top of the mountain. At some stage, however, these will need to converge at a solid bridge for negotiations. Such a bridge is already being built by civil society – activists, mayors, lawyers, parliamentarians – and a growing

number of governments. Learning from the *hibakusha* survivors and from scientists and doctors who have studied the effects of nuclear weapon explosions, it has become clear that – no matter what the justification, provocation or intention – nuclear weapon attacks and threats must become recognised in law as war crimes and crimes against humanity. Deterring aggression is a legitimate security objective, but a policy of deterrence constructed around so devastating and repugnant a weapon is indefensible.

The op-eds from the four cold war leaders changed the game by making it respectable to advocate nuclear disarmament. But from where they presently stand, they think the mountain top is too far away to be seen. If they moved slightly, in the direction of reducing the role and value accorded to nuclear weapons for deterrence, they would be able to see that what they thought were clouds obscuring a faraway mountain top was nothing more than a layer of cold war fog swirling around them and obscuring reality. They need to move a few steps further to reach the bridge that will devalue nuclear weapons and provide a crossover to nuclear abolition. From our vantage point already on the bridge, civil society can show you the legal and political footholds to assist you to climb above the fog to this bridge, from where the goal of a strong and comprehensive nuclear weapons treaty is clearly visible.

We do not underestimate the difficulties that will be encountered en route and cannot predict exactly when we will get there, as there will be many political, technical, verification and implementation challenges. Commitment and confidence in our ability to get to the nuclear-weapons-free destination before night falls again are essential. Making a start on the preparatory work for a nuclear weapons convention will mean courageous governments, elected representatives and citizens taking individual and collective initiatives that will hasten the journey and clear the obstacles from the path. Early steps will include removing nuclear reliance from deterrence doctrines and taking steps to universalise the legal recognition that any use of nuclear weapons would violate international law. Our route, timing and even humanity's survival will depend on whether we can commit and resource ourselves for this journey now. This NPT Review Conference needs to agree on the treaty destination and set in motion the preparatory process and plans to get there as quickly as humanly possible.

Thank you.

Recommendation: States parties are encouraged to include support for a nuclear weapons convention in their statements and working papers to the 2010 NPT Review Conference and to do their utmost to achieve recognition in any final document or disarmament decision of the need to commence preparatory work leading to negotiations on a universal nuclear weapons convention or framework treaty for the sustainable, verifiable, and enforceable abolition of nuclear weapons worldwide.

Appendix: Basic elements for a Nuclear Weapons Convention

Preamble

Enshrining the vision, objectives, ideals, context and exhortations.

General Obligations

A Nuclear Weapons Convention would need to prohibit the development, testing, production, stockpiling, transfer and use of nuclear weapons. States possessing nuclear weapons will be required to destroy their arsenals according to a series of phases. The treaty would also need to prevent the production of weapons-usable fissile material and address delivery vehicles, which would either need to be destroyed or converted to make them non-nuclear capable.

The obligations on states would be both negative (i.e. prohibition) – not to develop, test, produce, otherwise acquire, stockpile, deploy, maintain, retain or transfer nuclear weapons; and positive (i.e. disarmament) – to dismantle, destroy, prevent and convert nuclear weapons and facilities (as required). The treaty will also need to promulgate obligations on “persons”, that is a requirement on individuals and corporations as well as states not to assist anyone in developing, producing, acquiring or otherwise supplying or trading in nuclear weapons, their components, technologies or materials.

Phases for Elimination

A Nuclear Weapons Convention would need to identify steps and stages for the reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons. For example, the Model NWC outlines a series of five phases: take nuclear weapons off alert, remove weapons from deployment, remove nuclear warheads from

their delivery vehicles, disable the warheads, removing and disfiguring the “pits” and placing the fissile material under international controls and safeguards. In the initial phases, the United States and Russia would be required to make the deepest cuts in their nuclear arsenals.

Verification and Implementing Authority

A Nuclear Weapons Convention would need to establish a comprehensive verification regime backed up by a strong implementing authority. Considerations would include: Declarations and registration, providing enhanced transparency and confidence-building measures; an international monitoring system; intelligence and reporting (both ‘national technical means’ and societal monitoring by citizens, including protection for whistleblowers); open skies provisions; preventive controls (the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI) would be more acceptable if it were turned into a Prohibition Security Initiative); provisions for routine and ‘challenge’ on-site inspections covering previous nuclear-weapons-related sites, declared civilian facilities and also undeclared sites that might prompt concern.

International and National Implementation

Like any modern treaty, a Nuclear Weapons Convention would also require provisions on entry into force; compliance and enforcement; irreversibility and transparency; technology and resources for dismantlement and destruction; securing the nuclear materials (transport, storage and disposal); training and technical infrastructure and resources for verification. In view of the critical security considerations, this treaty should place the barriers to withdrawal extremely high, or else withdrawal following entry into force should not be permitted.

Security Considerations and Incentives

The transition to abolition would likely include securing and dismantling warheads and delivery vehicles; securing nuclear materials, facilities and technology; preventing theft and cleaning up contaminated sites to minimise health and environmental harm due to toxic and radioactive materials; deterring break-out and attempts by the current nuclear-armed states to retain a clandestine hedge; addressing rogue proliferators and terrorists; developing collective security approaches to promote peace and provide stability and confidence in place of the cold

Disarmament and Civil Society

war (and nuclear-weapons-related) concepts of strategic stability that still dominate the nuclear weapon states' mindsets. The principal incentives built into this treaty are about security. But in view of the importance many states presently attach to Article IV of the NPT, it may be necessary to offer other ways to incentivise adherence to the NWC and meet nations' energy needs without adding to proliferation problems, global heating and climate chaos. The Model NWC discusses an optional Protocol concerning energy assistance, which is worth exploring.

Summarised from: Securing our Survival, published by the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, April 2007. <http://www.icanw.org/securing-our-survival>

Statement of Jayantha Dhanapala*

Mr. President, Excellencies, Distinguished delegates,

This is a personal statement in my current capacity as a member of civil society based on my 25-year-old association with the NPT. I thank all concerned for accommodating me.

I am aware I speak to a multicultural audience - but Shakespeare belongs to world literature. The ghosts in his plays serve the purpose of pricking the conscience of the main characters. I speak, therefore, as a ghost from the 1995 Review and Extension Conference where the nuclear weapon states and their allies assured us all that an indefinite extension of the NPT was vital for predictability so that nuclear disarmament could be achieved. All delegations worked hard to adopt a package of three decisions and a Resolution on the Middle East to enable the NPT to be extended indefinitely without a vote. It was quite clearly not an unequivocal and unqualified extension. But the ink was scarcely dry on the package when we witnessed with dismay the disregard for the commitments made on many of the elements of the package.

Mr. President,

- In 1995 -we had 5 nuclear weapon states and one outside the NPT. Today, we have 9 nuclear weapon states – 4 of them outside the NPT one of which is being given special privileges by the entire Nuclear Suppliers Group in violation of Article I of the treaty and paragraph 12 of Decision II in the 1995 package. Another will soon receive two power reactors from a nuclear weapon state within the NPT.
- In 1970, we had a total of 38,153 nuclear warheads when the NPT entered into force. Today, 40 years later, we have 23,300 – just 11,853 less - with over 8000 on deployed status and the promise by the two main nuclear weapon states to reduce their deployed arsenals by 30% to 1550 each within seven years of the new START entering into force. Another NPT nuclear weapon state, the UK is on the verge of renewing its Trident nuclear weapon programme.
- In 1995, we had the certain prospect of negotiating a CTBT, which we finally achieved only to find, today, that its entry into force is blocked by two NPT nuclear weapon states and seven others. A

FMCT that was also envisaged in Decision II of the 1995 package was first obstructed by a NPT nuclear weapon state and is now blocked by one outside the NPT because existing stockpiles are not addressed in the negotiating mandate.

Implementing Decision I of the 1995 Package to strengthen the review process has been a hard struggle. On other elements of the package as well, commitments made in the 2000 Review Conference were rejected in 2005. All states experience changes of government either through democratic elections or through other means but the principle of state succession should apply not only in respect of treaties but also in respect of conference commitments made in consequence of Treaty obligations. There can be no 'exceptionalism' in this respect. Unless States parties agree on this principle they will continue to engage in mutual recrimination over fulfilling past commitments. Decision I enjoined all "to look forward as well as backward" at review conferences but when there is no confidence that past commitments are the basis for future action, States parties will be condemned to operate with rear view mirrors only.

Review Conferences are not rituals. They are intended as honest five yearly stocktaking exercises in a process of rigorous accountability holding States parties to their obligations in the past and recalibrating objectives for the future in a cumulative process. That assured predictability in the future course of this treaty will dispel any suspense as to whether review conferences would be successes or failures and how much further the tensile strength of the NPT will be tested. I am aware that many recipes and action plans have been prepared to ensure the success of this Review Conference. But diplomatic phraseology however adroit can no longer paper over fundamental differences permanently.

At the end of the 1995 conference I said from the chair - "The permanence of the treaty does not represent a permanence of unbalanced obligations, nor does it represent the permanence of nuclear apartheid between nuclear haves and have-nots." The regrettable exit of the DPRK from the NPT and its subsequent nuclear testing; the welcome return to compliance of Iraq and Libya; and continuing questions over Iran are some of the experiences we have had to go through since 1995. The nonproliferation norm can be strengthened by encouraging the multilateralization of the fuel cycle and the universalization of the Additional Protocol as voluntary options. Basically though, the failure

to implement nonproliferation and disarmament together is unsustainable. The year 2010 dawned with the promise of being a tipping point for nuclear disarmament after the global surge of public opinion in favour of a nuclear-weapon-free world. Indeed one year after the Prague speech of President Obama we have seen many events collectively hailed as a “Prague Spring”. But will that ‘spring’ blossom into a “summer”?

The continued modernization of nuclear weapon arsenals and their delivery systems, the limited reductions achieved by new START, the troubling ambiguities over the use of nuclear weapons and negative security assurances in the US Nuclear Posture Review and the persistence of nuclear deterrence in the doctrines of nuclear weapon states show that we have progressed very little. Whether it is the pressures of domestic politics and well-entrenched interest groups or a perceived inferiority in conventional weapons, it does not seem as if nuclear weapon states are ready to eliminate all their weapons even in a phased programme. Even disarmament commissions and some coalitions for nuclear abolition have set their target dates very far into the distant future building artificial base camps on the way to the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The focus on the DPRK and Iran - and on nuclear terrorism - also serves to distract attention from the inherent dangers of nuclear weapons themselves. It has been stated and restated that if there were no nuclear weapons under a verifiable nuclear disarmament regime there can be no proliferation or nuclear terrorism. How do we exercise our responsibility to protect the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free world?

The only credible alternative appears to be the proposal for a Nuclear Weapon Convention on which negotiations must begin immediately. We already have in the NPT one international compact, which was an agreement between nuclear-weapon states and non-nuclear-weapon States for a transitional period when the former would join the latter in a nuclear-weapon-free world. That has not happened for forty years. The hedging in the statements setting a nuclear-weapon-free world as an objective undermines the determination to reach that goal.

We do need a radical change. In the same manner as we have outlawed biological and chemical weapons among weapons of mass destruction; and, anti-personnel landmines and cluster weapons as inhumane conventional weapons, we need to begin the process of outlawing nuclear weapons.

Disarmament and Civil Society

Mr. President, I conclude by congratulating you as the first fellow Asian to take the chair of a NPT Review Conference after 1995 and wish you all success.

*(*Jayantha Dhanapala is a former Ambassador of Sri Lanka who chaired Main Committee I at the 1985 NPT Review Conference and was President of the 1995 NPT Review & Extension Conference. He was United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs from 1998-2003 and is currently President of the Pugwash Conferences on Science & World Affairs. These are his personal views.)*

Issues Related to Nuclear Disarmament and Non-Proliferation – Part I

Delivered by John Burroughs, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy; Drafting group: Ray Acheson, Reaching Critical Will of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom; John Burroughs, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy; John Hallam, People for Nuclear Disarmament Nuclear Flashpoints Project; John Kim, Fellowship of Reconciliation; Young Dae Ko, Solidarity for Peace and Reunification of Korea; Jae Won Lee, Solidarity for Peace and Reunification of Korea; Oh Hye-ran, Solidarity for Peace and Reunification of Korea; Elizabeth Shafer, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy; Steven Starr, Physicians for Social Responsibility; Hiromichi Umebayashi, Peace Depot Japan

Introduction

In two parts, this presentation addresses some of the key issues currently facing the non-proliferation/disarmament regime. In Part I, we begin with US-Russian negotiations, and then comment on modernization and investment; transparency and reporting; and operational status of nuclear forces. Part II addresses the CTBT and a fissile materials treaty; security assurances and alliances; the Korean peninsula and North-East Asia; NWFZs; preventing the further spread of nuclear weapons; and universality.

US-Russian Reductions and Beyond

The New START agreement signed April 8, 2010 by Presidents Medvedev and Obama will not fundamentally alter the nuclear balance of terror between the United States and Russia. The 2002 Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT) set a ceiling of 2200 strategic deployed warheads. Seven years after entry into force, New START would lower the ceiling to around 1500 warheads deployed on land- and submarine-based missiles, plus up to several hundred bombs assigned to heavy bombers.¹ This would not qualitatively change the relationship.

¹ See Pavel Podvig, "New START treaty in numbers," Russian strategic nuclear forces blog, March 27, 2010, at http://russianforces.org/blog/2010/03/new_start_treaty_in_numbers.shtml; Hans Kristensen, "New START Treaty Has New Counting," FAS Strategic Security Blog, March 29, 2010, at <http://www.fas.org/blog/ssp/2010/03/newstart.php>; Jeffrey Lewis, "Prague Treaty Cuts Are Modest, Real," ArmsControlWonk.com, April 5, 2010, at <http://www.armscontrolwonk.com/2682/prague-treaty-cuts-are-modest-real>.

The main virtue of the new agreement is that it will continue the process of reduction and ensure continued fulfillment of the verification and monitoring functions once met by START. One encouraging feature is that inspectors will verify the numbers of warheads deployed on missiles. In contrast, under START warheads were ascribed to permitted delivery systems.

The stakes—and the obstacles—would be much higher with respect to a subsequent agreement the Obama administration has indicated it would seek. Such an agreement following the START replacement could further reduce strategic warheads, reduce non-strategic warheads, and provide, for the first time, for verification of the dismantlement of withdrawn warheads. The result would be verified limits on the entire nuclear arsenals, not just deployed strategic warheads, of both sides. Provision should be made for international monitoring as well, to afford accountability.

Obstacles arise in part from the fact that Russia attaches great importance to its nuclear forces, including its non-strategic weapons, in view of its degraded security and military posture. And Russia will be reluctant to pursue deep strategic reductions while the United States engages in research and development regarding strategic anti-missile systems, makes advances in non-nuclear strategic strike systems, and holds open the option of deploying space-based strike and interceptor systems.²

On the US side, there will be opposition from influential elements to limitations on all three types of non-nuclear strategic systems.³ Tensions

² Russia's statement to the First Committee of the General Assembly on 15 October 2009 made clear that in negotiations after a START replacement is agreed, it will want to address all three types of non-nuclear strategic systems. See Viktor L. Vasiliev, Statement to the United Nations General Assembly First Committee, New York, 15 October 2009, at http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/political/1com/1com09/statements/15Oct_Russia.pdf.

³ In 2009, the US Congress adopted a provision on military spending in 2010 urging the President that the START replacement treaty not include any limitations on US ballistic missile defense systems, space capabilities, or advanced conventional weapons systems. For analysis and recommendations from a disarmament perspective, see Jürgen Scheffran, Ray Acheson, and Andrew Lichterman, "Missiles, Missile Defence, and Space Weapons," in Ray Acheson, ed., *Beyond arms control: challenges and choices for nuclear*

between the two countries over anti-missile systems are ongoing. Regarding non-nuclear strategic strike systems, the Obama administration has proposed about \$440 million in 2011 spending on “Long Range Strike” and “Prompt Global Strike,” and spending on related work is scattered throughout the budget.⁴ There likely would also be significant resistance within the US government to further reductions of strategic nuclear arms *per se*.⁵

From the standpoint of civil society, it would be unacceptable for Russia to put nuclear disarmament on hold pending improvement of its overall security posture. But it is also crucial for the United States to reassure Russia in deed as well as word that nuclear disarmament is part of the project of building common security.

The two countries should establish a process for Continuous Arms Reduction Talks (CART) bringing in other states that possess nuclear arsenals.⁶ Reductions could proceed in parallel with preparations, deliberations and negotiations for a Nuclear Weapons Convention.

A final but important observation regarding reductions: Negotiations can be derailed by domestic or international developments. It remains the case that the United States and Russia, and other states with nuclear

disarmament (2010), full text available at <http://reachingcriticalwill.org/resources/books/BAC/text.html>.

⁴ For a report on current thinking in the US government about “Prompt Global Strike,” see David Sanger and Thom Shanker, “U.S. Faces Choice on New Weapons for Fast Strikes,” *New York Times*, April 22, 2010.

⁵ For many in the US nuclear establishment, the New START levels may be as low as they are prepared to support. Those levels still enable the performance of missions historically assigned to US nuclear forces.

⁶ President Obama’s campaign pledge points in the direction of widening the reduction process: “I will initiate a high-level dialogue among all the declared nuclear-weapon states on how to make their nuclear capabilities more transparent, create greater confidence, and move toward meaningful reductions and the eventual elimination of all nuclear weapons.” *Arms Control Today 2008 Presidential Q&A*, September 10, 2008, <http://www.armscontrol.org/2008election>. The recently released US Nuclear Posture Review refers to strategic dialogue with China as well as Russia, and also identifies as an objective: “Following substantial further [post-New START] nuclear force reductions with Russia, engage other states possessing nuclear weapons, over time, in a multilateral effort to limit, reduce, and eventually all nuclear weapons worldwide.” US Department of Defense, *Nuclear Posture Review Report*, April 2010 (“NPR”), pp. 46-47. The problem with this approach is that it delays indefinitely the involvement of states other than the United States and Russia.

weapons, can and should undertake unilateral reductions, which can be politically coordinated.⁷ Such initiatives both reduce tension and invite reciprocation.⁸

Modernization and Investment

In and of themselves, reductions do not suffice to create a path to elimination. A key step toward multilateral nuclear disarmament is for all nuclear weapon states—including those outside of the NPT—to cease all research, development, modernization, and production of nuclear weapons.

Ending modernization and investment is mandated by the Article VI obligation to negotiate cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date, the principle of irreversibility agreed in 2000, and the principle of good faith. As Judge Mohammed Bedjaoui, former president of the International Court of Justice, has explained, good faith requires states “to respect the integrity” of the NPT and “to refrain from acts incompatible with [its] object and purpose;” good faith also proscribes “every initiative the effect of which would be to render impossible the conclusion of the contemplated disarmament treaty.”⁹

Yet research and development is taking place in all states possessing nuclear weapons for purposes of replacing existing systems; increasing reliability; and in some cases enhancing military capabilities. The horizon for planning is measured in decades.

In the United States, the weapons complex is being modernized even as it shrinks in size. Hoped-for US Senate approval of ratification

⁷ Unfortunately, the Nuclear Posture Review ties US reductions to the need to avoid “large disparities in nuclear capabilities” with Russia, not for any articulated strategic reason, but because they “could raise concerns on both sides and among U.S. allies and partners.” NPR at p. xi. The NPR does state that reductions following entry into force of New START “could be pursued through formal agreements and/or parallel voluntary measures.” *Id.* at p. 30.

⁸ There are precedents, among them the 1991 Presidential Nuclear Initiatives, and the 2001 US decision to undertake unilateral reductions in deployed strategic warheads prior to obtaining Russia’s agreement to implement corresponding changes and accept the 2002 SORT agreement.

⁹ Mohammed Bedjaoui, Keynote Address, Conference on Good Faith, International Law, and Elimination of Nuclear Weapons: The Once and Future Contributions of the International Court of Justice, May 1, 2008, Geneva, pp. 21-22, available at <http://www.lcnp.org/disarmament/2008May01eventBedjaoui.pdf>. He was President of the ICJ when it gave its 1996 advisory opinion on nuclear weapons.

of new START and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is already being conditioned on increased investment in new infrastructure for building nuclear weapon components, including their cores (“pits”).¹⁰ The new facilities would provide the capability to build-up nuclear forces should the decision be made to do so and to produce modified or new-design warheads. The Obama administration’s FY2011 budget request on 1 February includes \$7.282 billion for the weapons complex, about a 14% increase over FY2010.¹¹ Ambassador Linton Brooks commented that as head of the National Nuclear Security Administration under the previous president, he “would have killed for the FY11 budget.”¹² The request includes a major increase, to \$225 million for FY2011 alone, for building a new facility to produce pits at Los Alamos.¹³ Building weapons facilities that among other things provide the capability for expanding arsenals runs contrary to the principle of irreversibility.

Modernization of existing US warheads is also ongoing to extend their life and other features, including in some cases additional military capabilities.¹⁴ The Obama administration is now proposing that nearly

¹⁰ The US Congress appropriated \$32.5 million for work in 2010 on design of non-nuclear components of refurbished nuclear bomb, the B-61, currently deployed in Europe. Congress also appropriated \$97 million for design of a new facility to produce the plutonium cores of warheads at Los Alamos Laboratory, the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement (CMRR) Nuclear Facility, and \$94 million for design of the Uranium Processing Facility at Oak Ridge, Tennessee, which would build secondaries for warheads. A replacement Kansas City Plant in Missouri for production of non-nuclear components of warheads is also planned.

¹¹ Dr. Robert Civiak, “Enhancing Nuclear Weapons Research and Production to Enhance Disarmament?”, February 22, 2010, <http://www.trivalleycares.org/new/reports/FY2011BUDGETRPT.pdf>. Spending on the nuclear weapons complex is not the same as total spending on US nuclear forces. Stephen Schwartz and Deepti Choubey estimate that in 2008 US nuclear weapons-related spending totaled \$52.4 billion, of which over \$29 billion was on “nuclear forces and operational support.” Nuclear Security Spending: Assessing Costs, Examining Priorities, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2009, p. 7. Other categories within the total are deferred environmental and health costs, missile defense, nuclear threat reduction, and nuclear incident management.

¹² “Ambassador Linton Brooks on New START and the next agreement,” April 16, 2010, <http://csis.org/blog/ambassador-linton-brooks-new-start-and-next-treaty>.

¹³ *Department of Energy FY2011 Congressional Budget Request*, National Nuclear Security Administration, Office of the Administrator, Volume 1, February 2010.

¹⁴ The Obama administration’s Nuclear Posture Review states that warhead “life extension” work will proceed for the W76, deployed on submarine-launched

\$2 billion be spent from 2011 to 2015 on modernizing the B-61 gravity bomb, now deployed in Europe, among other things to make them compatible with the new nuclear-capable fighter jet, the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter.¹⁵ Unlike other nuclear weapon states, the United States is not now producing and deploying new versions of missiles, bombers, and submarines assigned to carrying nuclear warheads. However, the US Nuclear Posture Review outlines plans to develop and deploy new generations of delivery systems in the next two decades, including ballistic missile submarines and ICBMs.¹⁶ The United States will also study whether and how to replace the current air-launched cruise missile;¹⁷ and will not accept limits on its ongoing missile defense program.¹⁸ There is also intensive development of many other aspects of its nuclear forces, *e.g.* command and control and targeting capabilities.

Modernization of Russian nuclear forces is currently underway. In a November 2009 speech, President Dmitry Medvedev announced that the Russian military would receive “more than 30 ballistic land- and sea-based missiles” and three nuclear submarines in 2010.¹⁹ This is in line with previously announced Russian intentions to continuously modernize all three legs its nuclear triad—land-based intercontinental ballistic

ballistic missiles, the B61, deployed on fighter-bombers, and the W78, deployed on ICBMs. NPR at p. 39. While the NPR claims that the work will not “support new military missions or provide for new military capabilities,” in fact life extension for the W76 is adding to the capability to hit hard targets. See Greg Mello, “That Old Designing Fever,” *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, January/February 2000, Vol. 56, No. 1, pp. 51-57. Also, the military capability of a nuclear weapon does not depend on the warhead alone, and there are ongoing improvements in delivery systems, for example the F-35, targeting, command and control, etc.

¹⁵ Otfried Nassauer, “Washington Mulls Modernization of Aging Bombs,” *Spiegel Online*, March 15, 2010.

¹⁶ NPR at p. 23. The administration is proposing to spend \$672 million in 2011 for design of a new ballistic missile submarine, to be built in 2019. See John M. Donnelly, “Cost of Nuclear Subs Could Sink Navy Budget,” *Congressional Quarter Today Online News*, March 1, 2010.

¹⁷ *Id.* at p. 24.

¹⁸ *Id.* at p. x.

¹⁹ Robert S. Norris and Hans M. Kristensen, “Russian nuclear forces, 2010,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, January/February 2010, <http://thebulletin.metapress.com/content/4337066824700113/fulltext.pdf>.

missiles, submarines, and bombers.²⁰ Unlike the US “Stockpile Stewardship” program which is based on extending the service lives of existing warheads, maintenance of Russia’s nuclear stockpile has been based on the periodic reproduction of warheads. However, seemingly adopting the US method, in July 2009, President Medvedev announced that by 2011 Russia would develop supercomputers to monitor the effectiveness of its nuclear weapons.²¹

Similar reports can be made for all states possessing nuclear arsenals. As to other NPT nuclear weapon states, modernization of French nuclear forces includes deployment planned for this year of the new, longer-range M-51 intercontinental ballistic missile, on new generation ballistic missile submarines.²² Later this decade the missiles reportedly will be armed with a new warhead.²³ The United Kingdom is expected to begin design work in 2012-2014 on a new class of submarines to be armed with Trident missiles.²⁴ For its part, China is deploying new mobile missiles and a new class of ballistic missile submarine, and reportedly is increasing its number of nuclear warheads.²⁵

Trading some arms control agreements or arsenal reductions for modernized nuclear forces and modernized or new research and production facilities capable of building the nuclear threat anew is not disarmament. If the danger of nuclear war is to be eliminated, ceasing to plan and build for an eternal nuclear threat must come early, not late, in the process.

²⁰ NTI Research Library, Russia Profile, Russia: Nuclear Chronology, 2006 – 2009, http://www.nti.org/e_research/profiles/Russia/Nuclear/chronology_2006-2009.html.

²¹ Norris and Kristensen, *ibid*.

²² “French sub tests M51 with success,” UPI, January 29, 2010, available at http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2010/01/29/French-sub-tests-M51-with-success/UPI-72001264788477/.

²³ Robert S. Norris and Hans M. Kristensen, “French nuclear forces, 2008,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, September/October 2008, <http://thebulletin.metapress.com/content/k01h5q0wg50353k5/fulltext.pdf>.

²⁴ Ian Anthony, *The Future of Nuclear Weapons in NATO*, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, 2008, p. 24.

²⁵ Jeffrey Lewis, “Chinese Nuclear Posture and Force Modernization,” in Cristina Hansell and William C. Potter, eds., *Engaging China and Russia on Nuclear Disarmament*, Occasional Paper No. 15, James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, April 2009.

Transparency and Reproduction

At NPT review meetings, nuclear weapon states have provided general statements regarding, e.g., reductions of deployed weapons, and some have also declared their arsenal size and fissile material holdings. However, there is nothing even resembling an authoritative accounting of warhead and fissile material stockpiles, nuclear weapons delivery systems, and spending on nuclear forces. Non-governmental researchers make valiant efforts to fill the gap, but their assessments are for the most part estimates based only partly on official information. The need for accounting is obvious: it would provide baselines for evaluating progress in disarmament, and enable the identification of objective benchmarks. In his 24 October 2008 five-point proposal for disarmament, Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon called for expanded reporting, observing that the “lack of an authoritative estimate of the total number of nuclear weapons testifies to the need for greater transparency.” States should seek a commitment to establishment of a comprehensive, United Nations-based accounting system.

Operational Status of Nuclear Forces

In recent years, Chile, Malaysia, New Zealand, Nigeria, Sweden and Switzerland have sponsored the General Assembly resolution “Operational Readiness of Nuclear Weapons Systems.” Other resolutions have addressed the issue as well.²⁶ Last year, a very important report, *Reframing Nuclear De-Alert*, was released by the Swiss and New Zealand governments and the East-West Institute. It examines how to lower the state of operational readiness of US and Russian nuclear arsenals.²⁷

²⁶ India has for a number of years sponsored a resolution on Reducing Nuclear Dangers. In 2009, the “Renewed Determination” resolution championed by Japan was co-sponsored by the United States and supported by Russia. It calls for “measures to reduce the risk of an accidental or unauthorized launch of nuclear weapons and to also consider further reducing the operational status of nuclear weapons systems”

²⁷ The report was released last October at a First Committee event. One of the speakers, General (ret.) Eugene Habiger, former Commander in Chief of United States Strategic Command, strongly supported de-alerting, and said that it is feasible from a military point of view; what is required is a political decision. The recent report of the International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament also endorses measures to this end. The report observes that the “prospect that a catastrophic nuclear exchange could be triggered by a

There is no doubt that very high states of operational readiness still exist almost two decades after the Cold War supposedly ended.²⁸ The US and Russia continue each to maintain about one thousand nuclear warheads in a status such that some can be launched within less than two minutes, others within 10 minutes. Both President Obama and President Medvedev are at all times shadowed by someone with a briefcase from which either president can - in theory anyway - order a nuclear strike.

The problem with having a system primed for such a quick response is not so much that “rogue commanders” might fire one or two shots, or that computer error or equipment malfunction might result in launches, though that has nearly taken place at least twice that we know of. With response times so tight, presidents and senior military may have minutes (or less) to make decisions of utterly apocalyptic significance involving hundreds of warheads. If those decisions turn out to be based on honestly believed but completely false data, it is too late to recall the missiles and not possible to abort their missions. Decision-making under such tight time constraints and in such panic cannot ever be rational.

The risks inherent in this posture are simply unacceptable. This is especially so in the light of recent peer-reviewed research, which predicts that less than one percent of currently deployed and operational nuclear arsenals, if detonated in urban areas, would cause catastrophic damage to the global climate and environment. A “regional” nuclear war between India and Pakistan, for example, would loft millions of tons of smoke above cloud level and rapidly produce Ice Age weather conditions on Earth, leading to massive nuclear famine which could cause up to one billion people to die of starvation.

De-alerting should be pursued within or in connection with US-Russian nuclear arms reduction negotiations, and also should be a topic for wider consideration by states with nuclear arsenals. Care should be

false alarm is fearful, and not fanciful.” Eliminating nuclear threats: a practical agenda for global policymakers, Report of the International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, 2009, p. 27.

²⁸ The US Nuclear Posture Review states that “nearly all” US silo-based ICBMs are on alert, along with a “significant number of SSBNs [strategic ballistic missile submarines],” hopefully cutting through obfuscation about the matter. While the report states that the alert states will be maintained, it does contain welcome language about the need to increase presidential decision-making time during a nuclear crisis. NPR at pp. 25-27.

Disarmament and Civil Society

taken in implementing de-alerting measures to guard against worsening crisis stability problems. Urgent work is needed to reduce the risks of accidental or mistaken launch, which is feasible short of more ambitious steps like demating warheads from missiles.²⁹

The use of the main arsenals of the US and Russia would probably bring about the end of what we call civilization and possibly of our species. It is time to take the apocalypse off the agenda: It has been there too long.

²⁹ To this end, the United States and Russia should ensure that the Joint Data Exchange Center, agreed on by Presidents Clinton and Yeltsin over 10 years ago, is brought into operation.

Issues Related to Nuclear Disarmament and Non-Proliferation – Part II

Delivered by Jae Won Lee, Solidarity for Peace and Reunification of Korea; Drafting group: John Burroughs, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy; John Hallam, People for Nuclear Disarmament Nuclear Flashpoints Project; John Kim, Fellowship of Reconciliation; Young Dae Ko, Solidarity for Peace and Reunification of Korea; Jae Won Lee, Solidarity for Peace and Reunification of Korea; Oh Hye-ran, Solidarity for Peace and Reunification of Korea; Elizabeth Shafer, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy; Steven Starr, Physicians for Social Responsibility; Hiromichi Umebayashi, Peace Depot Japan

The CTBT and a Fissile Materials Treaty

The CTBT and a fissile materials treaty will be essential barriers to breakout from a nuclear weapons-free world. Prior to the achievement of that world, they will help constrain nuclear arms racing. That is especially true as to those states with nuclear arsenals that have conducted relatively few tests and produced smaller amounts of fissile materials. There are other advantages as well. In the case of the fissile materials treaty, if properly designed it will safeguard materials not designated for weapons including materials from withdrawn weapons, thus facilitating disarmament. In the case of the CTBT, during the Cold War testing served as a political signal of preparedness to use nuclear weapons and ratcheted up tensions. A ban will permanently end that ugly and dangerous practice. Finally, the two treaties and their verification regimes will reinforce the non-proliferation obligation.

The CTBT should not, however, be pursued at the cost of expanding weapons production capabilities and modernizing nuclear forces. And, conclusion of a fissile materials treaty must not be allowed to become a precondition to negotiations on global elimination of nuclear weapons. Indeed, it could be one track within more comprehensive negotiations.

Security Assurances and Alliances

The basic imperative regarding the role of nuclear weapons in security policies is to reduce that role to the point of non-existence. Here we focus on the relationship between nuclear and non-nuclear weapon states. Key steps in this direction are well understood.

First, strengthen the existing assurances of non-use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapon states.³⁰ The International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament recommends that this Review Conference agree on the need for assurances without any qualification to all states in compliance with the NPT as determined by the Security Council and the incorporation of the assurances in a binding Security Council resolution. The legally binding character of the assurances could also be confirmed by a treaty.³¹ A related important step is for nuclear weapon states to complete the process of signing and ratifying non-use protocols to NWFZs and to remove qualifications to their adherence.

Second, alliances should phase out extended nuclear deterrence. Signals from Germany and Japan have been promising. Germany has stated that it will advocate for adoption of a NATO no-first-use policy, and Japanese officials have also indicated support for such a policy.

³⁰ A positive aspect of the US Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) is that it prominently features the assurance. It also retracts a Clinton administration qualification, reinforced by the George W. Bush administration, reserving the option to respond with nuclear weapons to a non-nuclear weapon state's chemical or biological weapon attack or capability. NPR at pp. 15-16 (hedging, however, regarding the "catastrophic potential of biological weapons"). And it rules out, with respect to NPT non-weapon members, the 2001 NPR's specification of a wide range of scenarios - among them, "surprising military developments" - for use of nuclear weapons. One aspect of the recent NPR's statement of the assurance is problematic. That is the requirement that states receiving the assurance be "in compliance with their nuclear non-proliferation obligations." The NPR offers no detail on who is to decide this, but the implication is that in the end it is up to the United States. Nor does the NPR explain what the degree of non-compliance must be. In commenting on the NPR, however, US officials have said that they do not consider Iran to be covered by the assurance. Yet Iran does not have nuclear weapons and has not been found by any international body to be in breach of the fundamental NPT obligation set forth in Article II not to "manufacture or otherwise acquire" nuclear weapons. Other states have, like Iran, violated safeguards reporting rules; States parties are obligated to enter into safeguards agreements with the IAEA by Article III of the NPT. Further development of the assurances should clarify that determinations of non-compliance are to be made by authoritative international bodies and that only a breach of the Article II obligation of non-acquisition of nuclear weapons renders a state ineligible for the assurances.

³¹ See John Burroughs, "Response of the Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy to the Nuclear Posture Review Report," April 14, 2010, pp. 3-4, available at <http://lcnp.org/NPR%20response.pdf>.

Germany has also announced that it will advocate within NATO for the withdrawal of US nuclear bombs deployed under NATO auspices in Europe, and other NATO member states have called attention to the issue. The withdrawal should not, however, be made contingent on negotiations with Russia concerning its short-range nuclear forces.³² The US deployment in Europe is anomalous; the US nuclear bombs there are the only ones stationed on foreign territories. Deployment of nuclear weapons in “sharing” arrangements with “non-nuclear weapon states” is counter to at least the spirit of NPT Articles I and II, and serves as a terrible precedent. Russia’s continued deployment of large numbers of non-strategic nuclear weapons is also troubling and destabilizing, and should be ended.³³

As US alliances lessen and end reliance on nuclear weapons, current non-nuclear weapon states must not be given incentives to themselves acquire nuclear arms. One approach is embraced by the US Nuclear Posture Review but rejected by most of the NGOs represented here: strengthening the already very robust non-nuclear military components of alliance guarantees. Another approach supported by NGOs is to strengthen regional cooperative security mechanisms, including by establishing Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones (NWFZs). Here we briefly discuss measures to promote such a zone in North-East Asia.

Peace and Denuclearization in the Korean Peninsula and North-East Asia

A zone free of nuclear weapons, and the process of creating it, could contribute to the sustainable denuclearization of the Korean peninsula and a permanent regional peace. It would involve at least the DPRK, the Republic of Korea, and Japan, with security commitments from the United States, China, and Russia. The DPRK would relinquish its nuclear arsenal and nuclear weapons facilities, and receive in return binding assurances against use or threat of use of nuclear weapons – long a concern of DPRK leadership. The assurances should extend as well to threat or use of conventional weapons, consistent with the September 19,

³² This appears to be the current U.S. attitude. See Mark Landler, “U.S. Resists Push by Allies for Tactical Nuclear Cuts,” *New York Times*, April 22, 2010.

³³ Regarding Russia’s non-strategic nuclear weapons, see Robert S. Norris and Hans M. Kristensen, “Russian nuclear forces, 2010,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, January/February 2010, <http://thebulletin.metapress.com/content/4337066824700113/fulltext.pdf>.

2005 Six-Party Joint Statement. By providing Japan and the Republic of Korea binding assurances against use of nuclear weapons, a zone could also facilitate their lessening or ending reliance on US extended nuclear deterrence. The resumption of the currently frozen Six-Party talks could contribute to developing this process.

Some NGOs in the region and elsewhere underscore that the willingness of the United States and other concerned parties to replace the Korean War Armistice Agreement of 1953 with a peace treaty is the key to denuclearization of the Korean peninsula and North-East Asia. Also, the US should immediately renounce the option of first nuclear use against the DPRK and stop the annual large-scale military exercises with the ROK. In this view, the roots of the ongoing confrontation and the DPRK nuclear weapons program are found in : 1) the failure over sixty years to negotiate a formal end to the Korean War; 2) US introduction of nuclear weapons into the Republic of Korea beginning in the 1950s, a deployment ended in 1991 according to the US but not internationally verified; 3) the nuclear weapon-based guarantees that the US has given the ROK against an attack of any kind by the DPRK; 4) large and growing disparities in conventional military power between the DPRK and potential adversaries; and 5) US provocations in the last decade, including the naming of the DPRK as a target for first use in the 2001 Nuclear Posture Review and the unsanctioned invasion of Iraq. Consequently, only a determined effort to end the sixty year-old state of hostility through negotiation of a peace treaty will enable denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula and a regional NWFZ.

The Contribution of Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones

Existing NWFZs, and possible new ones, are a crucial component of the current non-proliferation regime, and a foundation for a nuclear-weapons-free world. We welcome the entry into force of two NWFZ agreements in 2009, the Treaty of Pelindaba in July and the Central Asia treaty in March. We congratulate member states of NWFZs for the successful conclusion of their second conference, held in New York last week. And we urge members of NWFZs to recognize and capitalize on their shared political clout, and to become a key collective player in the struggle for nuclear disarmament.

Preventing the Further Spread of Nuclear Weapons

We should resist the contention that progress in reducing the arsenals of existing nuclear powers is dependent on resolving existing or potential proliferation situations. Practically speaking, though, making the case for disarmament inevitably is conditioned by perceptions about proliferation. It is urgent that negotiations result in the DPRK's adherence to the NPT. And it is essential that Iran not decide to acquire nuclear weapons. In both of these cases as well, lack of compliance with United Nations Security Council resolutions undermines international law and collective security. At the same time, we are strongly opposed to the use of force in the name of nuclear non-proliferation.

There are multiple proposals to strengthen the non-proliferation regime, among them making the Additional Protocol the standard for participation in nuclear commerce; multilateralizing the production and supply of nuclear fuel; and bolstering security for nuclear materials. We recognize that many non-nuclear weapon states believe they have already "paid" for disarmament by joining and complying with the NPT and do not need to pay more. Nonetheless, achieving greater confidence in preventing the spread of nuclear weapons is good in and of itself, and also creates a better environment for progress on disarmament.

Universality

Finally, there is the imperative of universality. Issues regarding Israel and the DPRK may be addressed through regional zones. As to India and Pakistan, in Resolution 1887, the Security Council rather enigmatically called for non-members to meet the NPT's terms pending their accession. It is essential somehow productively to integrate the South Asian countries into the non-proliferation/disarmament regime. The Nuclear Suppliers Group exemption for India did little to advance this cause. While applying safeguards to the civilian nuclear sector, among other things it did not require India to cease production of materials for weapons, sign and ratify the CTBT, or formally accept the NPT disarmament obligation. Any such deal with Pakistan, or other non-NPT members, would be absolutely unacceptable.

Conclusion

While the topics discussed in this two-part presentation are diverse and complex, the objectives are the same in all cases: prevent use of nuclear weapons, and negotiate and implement measures in good faith to achieve an enduring nuclear weapons-free world.

Middle East Nuclear Weapon Free Zone

Delivered by Holly Lindamood, Daisy Alliance; Drafting group: Jonathan Frerichs, World Council of Churches; Holly Lindamood, Daisy Alliance; Dominic Moran, Greenpeace International

Mr. Chair, Distinguished Delegates,

The idea of a Middle East NWFZ, and later, a Middle East WMDFZ, has existed for thirty-five years. In principle, all states in the region have expressed support for a multilateral regional nonproliferation framework, but in practice, no progress has been made.

Given the pressing challenges we face, the continuation of politicking and point-scoring on the issue of the establishment of a Middle East WMDFZ cannot be allowed to continue.

Too much time has been wasted and we are now facing a situation where proliferation risks are mounting with no discernible progress, either towards establishing the basis for the universality of the Treaty or in laying the groundwork for arms control negotiations. Compounding this is the lack of progress on implementing the 1995 Middle East Resolution.

A WMDFZ in the Middle East should be strongly supported as an important contribution to global security and the nonproliferation regime. In the past, nuclear weapons free zones have proved a useful way to address such challenges.

In promoting a regional WMDFZ, it is essential that all regional states' programs should be in compliance with ratified NPT commitments, as a building block to future arms control agreements. The failure of some regional states to report ongoing or past nuclear development is a blow to the integrity of the Treaty and its necessary universalization and acts as a proliferation spur.

In order to move forward, the lesson from the failure of the ACRS must be learned—arms control mechanisms cannot be effectively established without parallel and substantive progress in peace negotiations and in healing diplomatic rifts. Without parallel negotiating tracks that bring all regional states into disarmament talks the success of peace talks is undermined and pressure for arms control moves evaporates.

Disarmament and Civil Society

New thinking is required that promotes Israeli engagement through parallel peace and disarmament negotiations that, allows progressive movement towards program transparency.

The Arab and Israeli positions are not mutually exclusive - there cannot be peace without security, or security without peace. Therefore, we call on regional state delegations to make a clear commitment to parallel peace and arms control tracks, in principle, ahead of negotiations.

Nuclear weapons states also have a responsibility to ensure global security and the maintenance of the nonproliferation regime. It is imperative that NWS live up to their commitments under the Middle East Resolution, "to extend their cooperation and exert their utmost efforts with a view to ensuring the early establishment by regional parties of a Middle East zone free of nuclear and all other weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems."³⁴

Here, the US, Russia, and the United Kingdom, as Depositary States and sponsors of the Resolution, must take a proactive role in initiating negotiations and providing security assurances to regional parties.

To this end, the EU has proposed that a seminar on Middle East security, disarmament and nonproliferation be convened, including all concerned parties. We recommend that the US, EU, and Russia work jointly to organize a seminar to consider practical confidence building measures such as small-scale scientific and civil society exchanges.

Here, it is important to recognize that the wider failure of nuclear weapons states to fulfill their NPT commitment to disarm is an invitation for certain non-NPT member states to develop and maintain their nuclear weapons stocks.

Significant international support will be required in fomenting progress towards developing regional disarmament mechanisms and bodies and in providing disinterested monitoring, verification and compliance services once these are in place. However, it is important to underline that the international community should play a facilitating but not determinant role in progress towards a Middle East WMD free zone, which is primarily the responsibility of regional states.

³⁴ 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference, Final Document Package of Decisions.

Here, it is time for Middle East states to back rhetoric with action and to take calculated risks together in promoting the steps necessary to the development of a WMD free zone.

Recommendations

International civil society recommends consideration of the following as potential steps to build momentum for a Middle East NWFZ:

- Israel's taking steps to unofficially bring its program into line with NPT provisions and deeper involvement in related international bodies would signal to Arab states its desire to conform to international nonproliferation and disarmament norms.
- Establishing a Middle East No First Use of WMD agreement should be considered and explored.
- Work to promote parallel Arab-Israeli peace negotiations and wider disarmament talks.
- Regional states should consider negotiations on comprehensive negative security assurances, backed by non-use pledges by all NWS.
- NFU declarations by Middle East regional parties would be useful confidence and security building measures and would signal their intent to develop momentum towards a WMDFZ.
- Freezing of sensitive nuclear fuel cycle activities leading to the establishment of a fuel cycle free zone could be considered as food for thought.
- While we recognize the difficulties facing this in the short-term, regional enrichment and reprocessing activities increase fears and act as a potential proliferation prompt.
- Work to secure progressive sign on to the CTBT, and other WMD-related treaties by all states in the Middle East, with each state to make clear that these constitute confidence measures prior to full MEWMDFZ negotiations.
- We encourage active cooperation between governments and civil society and strongly urge all regional states to participate in civil society workshops and conferences in an effort to promote common positions and establish relations of trust and amity.

Disarmament and Civil Society

A Middle East WMDFZ should not be about power, or politics, or inalienable rights, but rather should be viewed as a crucial step in achieving the primary goal of the Treaty - a world free from the threat of nuclear weapons. Any delay in its establishment may have a disastrous impact on regional and global security and the nonproliferation regime itself.

The NGO community looks forward to helping to move this process forward through our collective experience and activism.

Article IV: The NPT's Fault line

Delivered by Mary Olson, Nuclear Information and Resource Service; Drafting group: Felicity Hill, Research and Policy Adviser to Senator Ludlam, Australia; John Loretz, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War; Scott Ludlam, Australian Greens Senator for Western Australia; Mary Olson, Nuclear Information and Resource Service, Southeast, Asheville, NC USA; Diane Perlman, Psychologists for Social Responsibility, Virginia, USA; Elizabeth Shafer, J.D.; Alice Slater, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, NY; Philip White, International Liaison Officer, Citizens' Nuclear Information Center, Tokyo Japan

Nearly everyone at this conference supports the objectives of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. In this we represent the will of the vast majority of the world's population, reflected in countless opinion polls over a period of decades.

Progress on the NPT articles embodying the objectives of non-proliferation and disarmament has been painfully slow, intractable at times, but at least everyone here agrees that the objectives are worth pursuing.

The NPT's most grievous fault line is its so-called third pillar, the article which posed the development, research, production and use of nuclear energy as an inalienable right. Not cheap energy, or renewable energy, but nuclear energy.

This passage about "rights," repeated so often over the years, was written long before Three Mile Island, before Chernobyl and it must be noted that it was written more than two decades after the United Nation's Universal Declaration of Human Rights where articles 3 and 25 affirm that all people have the right to life and security of person, health and well being, which the risks and hazard of nuclear generated electric power does not support.

In these days of so-called 'nuclear renaissance', with the disarmament agenda revitalized after more than a decade of paralysis, it is essential that we engage this discussion head on, to identify why questions of nuclear energy remain so divisive.

No matter where you stand on the nuclear power debate, whether you support it, oppose it, or colour it with some shade of necessary evil, it is worth knowing a little about the footprint of the industry, and then look at some of the assumptions underpinning this long heralded renaissance.

Uranium Mining

Not our land – uranium mining continues to have its heaviest impacts on the traditional lands of native peoples, whether in North America, Australia, Africa or elsewhere.

Tailings waste – uranium mines leave behind a unique legacy of millions of tonnes of finely powdered radioactive waste rock, known as tailings. As ore grades fall and mines get larger, these tailings structures are growing in volume and as they grow, so too do the hazards.

Poisoning the well – Uranium mines are a huge user and polluter of water. All mines are different, but massive water use is one thing they have in common.

Not Carbon-Free -- While it is true that nuclear cooling towers do not release much CO₂, the mining and processing of uranium is completely dependent upon burning fossil fuels. In Australia the Olympic Dam uranium mining operation is actually the largest producer of Greenhouse gas in South Australia, and the proposed expansion of operations at this site will dramatically increase those emissions since it will entail moving a million tonnes of rock each day for four years (a billion tonnes total).

Historically the enrichment of uranium also depended on large carbon and chlorofluorocarbon releases. Today these activities are not carbon neutral, nor are the many transportation links in the uranium fuel chain.

Radiation

Reactors emit pollutants – ongoing releases of radioactivity to air, water and via the production of so-called “low-level” radioactive waste. Irradiated fuel (and reprocessing wastes) from nuclear power plants is among the most concentrated forms of radioactive waste accounting for over 90% of all radioactivity in androgenic waste. No nation has yet demonstrated permanent isolation of these wastes from the habitable biosphere.

Not Our Bodies -- Ionizing radiation, by definition, does damage to living tissue. There are now 438 reactors with 55 more under constructions in 31 countries — all releasing radioactivity, making radioactive

waste that includes deadly bomb materials.^[1] Many studies report higher incidences of cancer associated with a wide variety of nuclear facilities, ranging from uranium mines and mills to nuclear reactors and reprocessing plants.

A US National Research Council 2005 study reported that exposure to X-rays and gamma rays, even at low-dose levels, can cause cancer. The committee defined “low-dose” as a range from near zero up to about... 10 times that from a CT scan. “There appears to be no threshold below which exposure can be viewed as harmless,” said one NRC panelist.

Tens of thousands of tons of nuclear waste accumulate at civilian reactors with no solution for its storage. Reactors release mutagenic doses of radioactive waste into our air, water and soil and contaminate our planet and its inhabitants for eons.

Nuclear Renaissance is Not the Answer

Many promoters of nuclear generated electricity suggest that a revival of this fading technology is needed because of the necessity of changing carbon energy policy and climate stabilization. Nonetheless, the problem which underlies the destabilization of our global climate: unsustainable consumption in the global north will not be addressed by a nuclear revival; in fact, nuclear power will only reinforce that pattern of consumption. In addition, the prohibitive level of capital commitment, overall cost, plus the long delay in carbon emission off-set due to massive construction times plus the time required to pay the “carbon debt” of power plant construction and uranium fuel production will result in the crowding out of better alternatives. Nuclear energy is an obstacle to solving the problem of global warming, not a solution. The need for an immediate commitment to climate stabilization reinforces the idea that nations that have not developed nuclear electricity generating capacity would do well to “leapfrog” over this troubling stage directly to energy efficiency and distributed generation of renewable sources of power such as solar,

^[1] <http://www.euronuclear.org/info/encyclopedia/n/nuclear-power-plant-world-wide.htm>.

^[2] htmw.cia.gov/news-information/speechestestimony/2004/dci_speech_02142004.html.

^[3] <http://news-service.stanford.edu/pr/2005/pr-abrams-102605.html>.

wind, appropriate hydro, geothermal, and other sustainable technologies.

It is also clear that nations with nuclear generating infrastructure are not, on the whole, going to be addressing the climate crisis with new nuclear build and will fare better in meeting climate goals through energy efficiency, renewable energy and a phase-out of existing nuclear power plants.³⁵

Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists: “As we see it, however, the world is not now safe for a rapid global expansion of nuclear energy. Such an expansion carries with it a high risk of misusing uranium enrichment plants and separated plutonium to create bombs.”

Capacity curve What happened at the end of the 1970s that killed growth in the civil nuclear power sector?

Cost curves Well before the industry was hit by TMI and Chernobyl, it was drowning in red ink. Since then, things have got a lot worse.

Cost assessments The balance sheet proves that nuclear reactors are an extremely expensive method of boiling water. Further, centralized power stations are less efficient than making electric power closer to the point of use.

What happens next? Current projections of new reactor build – even the most ambitious projections for build in China and India, still indicate that reactors will be decommissioned faster than they will be built. It is still too early to say what is going to happen, but whatever nuclear construction occurs will come with an enormous economic and environmental price tag.

In 2007, world nuclear electricity generation fell by 2% – more than in any other year since the first reactor was connected to the grid in 1954. (Schneider et al., 2009)

* In 2008, not a single new plant was connected to the grid – the first time that happened since 1955; and uprates were offset by plant closures resulting in a net world nuclear capacity decline of about 1.6 gigawatts. (Schneider et al., 2009; BP, 2009)

³⁵ <http://www.carbonfreenuclearfree.org>

* In 2009, there were two reactor start-ups but four permanent shut-downs and net capacity fell by 0.86 gigawatts. (World Nuclear News, 2010)

Outcompeted by renewable energy It is a fact that renewable energy sources can be deployed more rapidly than nuclear power, and credible clean energy scenarios have been developed which sharply reduce emissions from the electricity sector without recourse to nuclear power.

Renewable energy – mostly hydroelectricity – already generates more electricity worldwide than nuclear power. Solar and wind energy have maintained growth rates between 20 and 30% for the last decade, and are now doubling in capacity roughly every three years.

Multiple studies show that renewable energy sources can be deployed more rapidly than nuclear power, and credible clean energy scenarios have been developed which sharply reduce emissions from the electricity sector while also bringing prices down without recourse to nuclear power. (See Carbon Free, Nuclear Free: A Roadmap to US Energy Policy www.carbonfreenuclearfree.org)

The exact mix of technologies will, and should be, determined by a combination of local resource availability, technological adaptability, and democratic principles. Vision is what is needed rather than a rigidly determined path.

Clearly nations with both nuclear weapons and nuclear power have saddled themselves with a burden of expensive, dangerous and brittle infrastructure with an expanding legacy of waste for which there is no solution. While it is too late for these countries to “leapfrog” over the nuclear energy option, it would serve them better in terms of health, climate goals and sustainable economy to phase out nuclear while phasing in aggressive programs to utilize wasted energy and phase in solar, wind and other renewables now, rather than re-invest in nuclear power.

The Unbreakable Link

The lesson of the four decades since the NPT came into force is that regime after regime has used the pretext of their ‘inalienable right’ under Article IV to advance nuclear weapons agendas.

All current civilian reactors either make weapons-usable plutonium from uranium fuel, or are powered directly by plutonium. There is also the possibility of enrichment plants used to enrich uranium for fuel to be reconfigured for production of HEU for weapons use. This is the reason that the CTBT insisted on the signatures and ratification of all nations having nuclear reactors. In other words, by having a nuclear reactor, a nation, ipso facto, does have the capacity to make nuclear weapons.

While Pakistan and Israel got the fissile materials for their nuclear weapons from military reactors, this doesn't discount the truth – which is that nuclear reactors are required to make nuclear weapons. This explains the concern over Iran.

The spread of civil reactor technology has provided cover for many countries to proceed varying distances down the path of nuclear weapons development. North Korea is the most notorious example, but there are also reports and speculation that Burma may be pursuing weapons.

Separation of plutonium through reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel and the creation of a global plutonium economy exacerbates the problem. It is fundamentally contrary and counterproductive to the NPT commitment to retire nuclear weapons, since it would put weapons-usable materials directly into global commerce.

Seen in this light, the recent US-Russia agreement for each nation to take 34 metric tons of plutonium removed from nuclear weapons and make MOX (mixed oxide) fuel to generate nuclear power is a step in the wrong direction. It is particularly problematic that Russian breeder reactors will be used for this plutonium disposition, and that the United States is investing in the development of fast reactors (a form of breeder). Breeder reactors may be used for both burning and breeding plutonium, which offers countries which operate these reactors the possibility of actually producing more plutonium rather than net destruction of the element. The goal of making the surplus weapons plutonium highly radioactive could be accomplished through combining the former weapons material with existing highly radioactive waste and then vitrified.

Plutonium fuels are also contraindicated from a public health perspective since plutonium is harder to control in an energy reactor and the spent fuel is more radioactive. If control is lost it could lead to a catastrophic accident, the result of which would be twice as deadly (in terms of latent cancer fatalities) compared to the same circumstance with

uranium fuel. The suggestion that “burning” plutonium makes the world safer is not only a risky idea from the perspective of nuclear weapons proliferation: fission of transuranics results in even greater quantities of biologically active, highly mutagenic fission products.

In 2010, the inalienable right to nuclear energy as invoked by Article IV amounts to the inalienable right of an expensive industry to massive subsidies, the inalienable right to expose citizens to routine hazardous releases of radiation and the inalienable right to produce contamination that science cannot yet contain arising from large quantities of radioactive waste. It is inappropriate to elevate an activity that is limited to one or two generations in benefit, but results in a liability that will persist for thousands of human generations to come, to the text of a Treaty as an “inalienable right”. The qualification of the NPT right to peaceful nuclear energy as “inalienable” should be understood in the context of the NPT bargain, and not as a claim that it is a fundamental aspect of sovereignty. The Treaty reads:

Nothing in this Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all the Parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes...

Inalienable rights, by definition may only be invoked – not conferred. Indeed this is an excerpt from recent legal research on the matter:

*Inalienable rights are generally distinguished from legal rights established by a State because they are moral or natural rights, inherent in the very essence of an individual. The notion of inalienable rights appeared in Islamic law and jurisprudence which denied a ruler “the right to take away from his subjects certain rights which inhere in his or her person as a human being” and “become Rights by reason of the fact that they are given to a subject by a law and from a source which no ruler can question or alter”. John Locke, the great Enlightenment thinker was thought to be influenced in his concept of inalienable rights by his attendance at lectures on Arabic studies. (reference: ^ Judge Weeramantry, Christopher G. (1997), *Justice Without Frontiers*, Brill Publishers, pp. 8, 132, 135, ISBN 9041102418)*

Perhaps the framers’ of the Non-Proliferation Treaty’s incorporation of this passage about nations was an attempt to acknowledge (somewhat ironically when it comes to splitting atoms) the parity of all peoples in relation to new technologies – it is not correct for some nations to “have”

new technology and other nations to “have not.” Since the treaty enshrines the stated commitment for all nations to eventually “not have” nuclear weapons, it is a fundamental contradiction for the treaty to promote the production of fissile materials through non-military nuclear energy and remains a contradiction for the United Nations to have an agency devoted to this purpose.

Call for IRENA to Supersede Article IV

It is time to bring the NPT into conformity with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which affirms that everyone has a right to health and well being. Just as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty cancelled the right to peaceful nuclear explosions in Article V of the NPT, we urge you to adopt a protocol to the NPT mandating participation of Parties in the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA) which would revise the Article IV right to “peaceful” nuclear technology and guarantee assistance to Parties to attain a sustainable economy through development of sustainable energy. There are now 143 nations participating in IRENA. (www.irena.org)

The right of all peoples to sources of energy is not being disputed here. If there still needs to be a carrot in the NPT which would reward non-nuclear weapons states for not pursuing nuclear weapons with an energy technology, let that technology be renewable and clean.

Nuclear power is neither.

Recommendations

- All nations join the recently launched Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA) which now has 143 members.
- Instead of clinging jealously to the outdated and legally unsound notion of an “inalienable right” to nuclear energy, countries should leapfrog directly to the future, based on energy efficiency, distributed energy and renewable energy sources.
- Reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel and the use of fuel cycles based on plutonium should be phased out.
- Nations should adopt consideration of all “external” costs and impacts of energy generation alternatives in selecting climate-

NGO presentations at the 2010 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference

stabilization strategies worthy of public funding and other public benefits.

- All nations currently using nuclear energy, adopt plans to phase it out.
- The United Nations should sunset the nuclear power promotion role of the IAEA.
- All nations phase-in abundant safe energy of the sun, wind, tides and heat of the earth.

Statement by a meeting of non-governmental experts from countries belonging to the New Agenda Coalition

Delivered by Ms. Amelia Broodryk (South Africa), Institute for Security Studies; Drafting group: Ambassador Mohamed I Shaker (Egypt), Egyptian Council for Foreign Affairs; Ambassador Abdel Raouf El Reedy (Egypt), Egyptian Council for Foreign Affairs; Ms Haidy Ghoneim (Egypt), Egyptian Council for Foreign Affairs; Mr Tony D'Costa (Ireland), Pax Christi, International Catholic Peace Movement; Professor Olga Pellicer (Mexico), Mexican Council on Foreign Relations, Mr Fernando Solana (Mexico), Mexican Council on Foreign Relations; Dr Kate Dewes (New Zealand), The Peace Foundation Disarmament and Security Centre; Mr. Alyn Ware (New Zealand), The Peace Foundation Disarmament and Security Centre; Mr. Noel Stott (South Africa), Institute for Security Studies; Ms Amelia Broodryk (South Africa), Institute for Security Studies; Dr Ian Anthony (Sweden) Stockholm International Peace Research Institute

A Group of non-governmental experts from the New Agenda Coalition countries (NAC) was established in 2007 in order to support the efforts of the NAC and offer input for the promotion of nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation with a particular focus on the 2010 NPT Review cycle. The NAC-NGO group met during the 2008 and 2009 NPT Preparatory Committee meetings and submitted statements to these. The following statement is released for consideration of the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

We strongly believe in the importance of the three pillars of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT): achieving nuclear disarmament, preventing nuclear proliferation, and acknowledging the right to peaceful uses of nuclear technology. The 2010 Review Conference offers one of the best opportunities in many years for States to make significant progress towards achieving these objectives.

The 2010 Review Conference is taking place at a very propitious moment following numerous statements and initiatives from high-level policy-makers and former policy-makers supporting the call for work to accelerate achieving a nuclear-weapons-free world. Never before has there been such a global consensus on the security benefits and feasibility of realizing such a goal.

While considerable challenges remain in preventing proliferation and attaining a nuclear-weapons-free world, the political climate is more conducive than before, to enhance the 13 practical steps agreed in 2000, and to implement fully the package agreed upon at the 1995 NPT Review

and Extension Conference including the Middle East Resolution. We call upon all States to further develop a global security environment that is based on mutual trust and benefit, equality and cooperation and one that ensures common security for all members of the international community in order to remove any justification for States to acquire, develop or maintain nuclear weapons.

Stockpile Reductions

We call on all nuclear-armed states to undertake unilateral reductions in their respective arsenals, and to commence mutual, plurilateral disarmament negotiations. The US and Russia have recently signed the START replacement agreement, which creates the conditions for further reductions. We commend and support Russia and the US for their achievements. We encourage steps to diminish the role of nuclear weapons in security policies and military doctrines in order to support the phasing out of short-range nuclear weapons and the withdrawal of all nuclear weapons from foreign soil and forward deployment.

Nuclear Doctrine

The threat from nuclear weapons is exacerbated by continuing doctrines that include inter alia: launch-on-warning, threat of use and potential use of nuclear weapons against a wide range of threats including those arising from the development of other weapons of mass destruction or even conventional weapons. We strongly believe that the existence of nuclear weapons represents a threat to the survival of humanity and that the only real guarantee against their use or threat of use is their total elimination. Accordingly, we call on the Nuclear Weapon States (NWS) to recognize the International Court of Justice (ICJ) Advisory Opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons on 8 July 1996 and move quickly to eliminate all nuclear weapons. As important confidence building steps, we call on NWS to renounce launch-on-warning and first-use doctrines, and take remaining nuclear arsenals off high-operational-readiness-to-use (high alert). Consequently, we affirm that the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons constitutes a breach of international law and the United Nations Charter, and a crime against humanity, as declared by United Nations General Assembly Resolution 1653 (XVI), of 24 November 1961, 33/71 B, of 14 December 1978, 34/83

G, of 11 December 1979, 35/152 D, of 12 December 1980 and 36/91 I, of 9 December 1981.

Allies of the NWS also have a special responsibility towards the achievement of nuclear weapons disarmament and should take steps to reduce and eliminate the role of nuclear weapons in their security relationships by phasing out extended nuclear deterrence and strengthening regional cooperative security mechanisms including the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs).

Transparency and Verification

The confidence of States to move toward a nuclear-weapons-free world will require verification of initial steps and the building of a system for verifying reductions to zero nuclear weapons. The NWS should start this process through establishing a United Nations-based accounting system covering all existing nuclear weapons, delivery systems, fissile material stockpiles and spending on nuclear forces. NWS and Non-Nuclear Weapon States (NNWS) should also explore and start to develop, in conjunction with NGO experts, the mechanisms and technologies for comprehensive verification for a nuclear-weapons-free world. To initiate a transparency process, the nuclear-armed states should unilaterally declare their nuclear weapon stockpiles.

Framework for Elimination

We are encouraged by the expert reports and draft programs for the abolition and elimination of nuclear weapons including the Report of the International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, and the United Nations Secretary-General's five-point plan for nuclear disarmament. These indicate the importance of working on a comprehensive program for nuclear disarmament alongside work on initial steps. We thus call on States to commence a preparatory process for a Nuclear Weapons Convention, or package of agreements, in order to explore the legal, technical, institutional and political measures required to achieve and maintain a nuclear-weapons-free world, and to start developing and implementing those measures currently feasible.

Security Assurances

The existence of nuclear arsenals increases the threat of using such weapons against NNWS, maximizing the proliferation risks. We urge the

NWS to provide effective guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against them. In this regard, in addition to the commitments taken on within the framework of United Nations Security Council Resolution 984 (1995) and the legally binding security assurances in the relevant Protocols to treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs), we call upon the NWS to accelerate ratifying the remaining protocols to the regional NWFZ treaties. In addition, we also urge NWS to embark on negotiating and concluding a universal, unconditional and legally-binding convention on security assurances for NNWS. Until the conclusion of such a convention, NWS must respect their existing commitments regarding security assurances. As Negative Security Assurances are key elements in the establishment of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones, priority attention should be given to this particular aspect in future agreements.

Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones

Nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) play an important role in reducing the role of nuclear weapons in a region, providing guarantees that nuclear weapons will not be used against States in the region, and building the cooperative mechanisms for security that will help achieve a nuclear-weapons-free world. We applaud the recent entry-into-force of the African and Central Asian NWFZs, and we support the exploration of establishing NWFZs in North East Asia, the Arctic, other regions and single state NWFZs. In this regards, we urge all States to extend their cooperation and to exert their utmost efforts with a view to ensure the early establishment of such NWFZs.

The Middle East

The Middle East is a region of special concern given the situation that one State in the region – Israel – continues to remain outside the NPT, which is known to have developed a nuclear-weapon capability. Iran, which is a party to the NPT, is developing sensitive technologies. We support a non-discriminatory approach to this situation by taking steps to implement the package deal reached in 1995 that contained invaluable steps toward a regional Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in the Middle East (MENWFZ). In order to move forward on this issue we fully support the Egyptian proposal supported by Arab and Non-Aligned States (NAM) to convene a regional / international conference to achieve such a goal.

Disarmament and Civil Society

We expect the NPT Review Conference to endorse such an initiative and recommend convening such a conference within a year.

Universality

The international community shares responsibility to uphold nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation by reinforcing universality of the NPT for the sake of regional and international peace and security. Accordingly, increased efforts must be made to engage with India, Pakistan, Israel and the Democratic Peoples' Republic of Korea to accept non-proliferation and disarmament obligations, and to join or (rejoin) the NPT as NNWS in order to strengthen the ultimate goal of the Treaty and attain universality. In the mean time, bringing the aforementioned States closer to the regime should in no way compromise the integrity of the NPT.

Nuclear Energy

We reaffirm the inalienable right of States to develop their energy resources in order to meet their economic and social needs, consistent with global environmental preoccupations. In accordance with Article IV, we also reaffirm the right of States Party to the NPT to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The introduction of nuclear power in more countries must not lead to nuclear weapon proliferation; we urge all non-NWS to abide by existing IAEA safeguards and to work to strengthen the IAEA system.

The internationalization of the nuclear fuel cycle should create a more democratic global model that allows all parties involved in a project to participate in decision-making concerning the supply of enriched fuel. The IAEA should play a key role in this process. It is worth noting that providing incentives by sharing nuclear technology with nations outside the NPT, while depriving and withholding benefits of access to nuclear material and technology for peaceful purposes from those who comply with their NPT obligations, would undermine the stability of the treaty with damaging consequences.

We encourage States to fully support the International Renewable Energy Agency and to utilize its expertise in order to develop energy supplies that are environmentally safe and free from the risks of nuclear weapons proliferation.

Nuclear Terrorism

The danger of illicit trafficking of nuclear materials and their means of delivery and related materials by non-state actors constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security. Thus, strengthening the implementation of Security Council Resolution 1540 adopted on 28 April 2004 and supplemented by Resolutions 1673 (2006) and 1810 (2008) would enhance and consolidate international cooperation in dealing with this challenge.

In 2005, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the International Convention for Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism which should be universally adhered to as it provides a legal basis for international cooperation in the investigation, prosecution, and extradition of those who commit terrorist acts involving radioactive materials or a nuclear device. In addition, in 2005, the United Nations Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, which criminalizes acts of sabotage against civilian nuclear facilities, was amended to establish a legal obligation to secure nuclear materials in storage as well as in transport. Accordingly, all states, in line with the outcome of the recent Nuclear Security Summit, should take appropriate steps to ensure that they retain secure custody of sensitive materials, equipment and technology and to prevent diversion from peaceful purposes, whether at home or in other countries. We recognize that some countries may require assistance in implementing these obligations in accordance with Security Council Resolution 1540.

Prevention Measures

In order to prevent the development and modernization of nuclear weapons, States should ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), close all remaining nuclear-testing sites and participate in good faith negotiations on a fissile materials treaty that deals with both production and stockpiles. NWS should no longer design, develop or modernize nuclear weapons.

Follow up Mechanism

We believe that a follow up mechanism is urgently needed between Review Conferences in order to oversee the state of implementation of their outcomes and results emanating from the Conferences. The outgoing

Disarmament and Civil Society

President of each conference and his or her bureau could constitute the core of such a mechanism.

Role of Civil Society

We believe that building the political momentum and developing the mechanisms to achieve a nuclear-weapons-free world will require collaboration between governments and key sectors of civil society including legislators, scientists, academics, youth and media. We encourage the NPT Review process and the relevant United Nations bodies to enable in their deliberations the fullest possible participation of civil society. We reaffirm the importance of implementing the recommendations of the 2002 United Nations Study on Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Education.

Conclusion

We pledge to work to the best of our abilities to support governments in their deliberations during the 2010 NPT Review Conference in order to agree to an effective and comprehensive nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament program that will lead inexorably to the achievement of a nuclear-weapons-free world.

Religious Leaders Statement

Delivered by Most Venerable Gijun Sugitani, Religions for Peace

We are grateful that the vision of a world without nuclear weapons has been compellingly revived in recent years through a welcome series of statements and challenges by eminent figures on the global security stage. And we are convinced that the States now gathering for the eighth Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) have a unique opportunity to bring that vision significantly closer to fulfillment.

Our religious traditions affirm the ultimate value of each human life and call us to respect all life. They weapons place earthly life in our all-too-human hands. Possessing them, we claim the globe as acceptable collateral for selfish interests. The ethical consequence is that to be human is to be responsible to the god in which we believe. Where humanity is inclined to be selfish and violent, proud and wasteful, the fact that we are under this authority calls us to humility and stewardship; to a wisdom greater than individual or national self-interest.

Furthermore, as the A-bomb survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki have suffered from the aftereffects of the radioactivity of the A-bomb, nuclear weapons also give lifelong suffering to victims. We believe that the use of nuclear weapons, whether possessed by states or terrorist organizations, inherently immoral, and their existence itself must be denied. Such weapons should be eliminated once and for all.

The United States and Russia carry the heaviest weight of responsibility to set an ambitious pace down that path. We are therefore especially pleased that President's Barack Obama and Dmitry Medvedev have jointly and unequivocally affirmed a common goal of achieving a world without nuclear weapons. They now face the challenge of bringing their respective national policies and postures into alignment with that vision and broadening that vision to include other States that possess or covet such weapons.

We believe that nuclear disarmament will have to be codified through a single global convention that can both promote and verify a complete ban on nuclear weapons. While the timing for pursuing such a convention must be carefully considered, we are convinced that this is the moment to establish the technical and legal details to facilitate total

Disarmament and Civil Society

nuclear disarmament and to set specific timelines for achieving the realistic goal of a world without nuclear weapons. We urge the NPT Review Conference to facilitate such an effort.

The faith-based partners of Religions for Peace understand that we have our own role to play in encouraging our respective faith communities to become part of a great global movement for nuclear disarmament.

We recognize that the world now faces a variety of critical security challenges, including many that do not directly involve weapons of mass destruction -- economic crises, climate change, energy deficits, acute water shortages, unrelenting hunger, grossly inadequate health services, the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons, and more. These and other security challenges create misery and uncertainty in the global community but also allow nuclear weapons states to justify the continued possession of their deadly arsenals.

We in the religious community can do more to help eliminate these security-related excuses for possessing or acquiring nuclear weapons, and we pledge to do so. We strongly advocate that rather than ensuring security, nuclear weapons compromise security. We pledge to advance a truer understanding of what it means to be safe; one in which armaments hold little value. Each person's vulnerability is an invitation to approach others with compassion. Our inter-relatedness calls us to cooperate to protect all persons and our earth. Today, my security depends on yours and no one is safer than the most vulnerable among us. We emphasize that this lingering idea that nuclear weapons can protect people is what allows the continued possession of nuclear weapons.

Speech by the Mayor of Hiroshima

Drafted and delivered by Tadatoshi Akiba, Mayor of Hiroshima, President of Mayors for Peace

Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, it is my honor and privilege to say a few words, representing the citizens of Hiroshima, our *hibakusha* in particular, and the nearly 4,000 city mayors from round the world who belong to Mayors for Peace.

Two weeks ago, the InterAction Council held its 28th Annual Plenary Meeting in Hiroshima, where 15 former heads of state and government, as well as 19 experts and special guests, participated and discussed how humanity should realize a nuclear free world.

In the Final Communiqué, they recommended with a keen sense of urgency that world leaders, especially from nuclear-armed States, should visit Hiroshima to understand the suffering and destruction caused by nuclear weapons and help to inform the public about the dangers of nuclear weapons.

Nearly 4,000 mayors around the world agree. Cities and mayors do understand the importance of remembering the past because most of us have experienced, at one time or other, the agonies, sufferings and pains caused by war or other kinds of tragedies. And one solemn fact is that all of us, mayors and citizens, have come to the unanimous conclusion, “Never again!”

In the *hibakusha*’s words, “No one else should ever suffer as we did.” Please note that the expression “no one” literally means everyone, including those whom we normally label as enemies. It is the spirit of reconciliation and not of retaliation.

Pope John Paul II sanctified this message. In the speech he delivered in 1981 in the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park, he asserted that “To remember the past is to commit oneself to the future.”

But that future will never come unless all of you, who have the power to decide, choose to commence immediately, negotiations leading to a nuclear-weapon-free world within a finite period of time. Mayors for Peace believe that we can reach that goal by the year 2020.

The year 2020 is essential because it is the natural limit imposed by the average age of the *hibakusha*, which is now over 75. We are duty

Disarmament and Civil Society

bound to abolish nuclear weapons while they are still alive. We do owe it to them, who have shown us through their sufferings and sacrifices, that nuclear weapons are absolute evil.

It is my duty to warn you that if we should deny this wish of the *hibakusha*, we are also denying their other wish as well.

Time is of the essence. As we all know so well, certain matters lose all meaning if you miss the crucial timing: it's too late to feed a starving person after his death. And in our case, what matters is human survival.

Consequently, the abolition of nuclear weapons should be at the top of the agenda of any organization concerned with creating a better future, especially the United Nations.

In addition to the united voices of mayors deeply rooted in their citizens' hearts demanding a nuclear-weapon-free world, prominent leaders of the world, who share the sense of urgency with the *hibakusha*, are now creating the new tidal wave for disarmament. President Obama has been working tirelessly to accomplish this goal. Secretary General Ban Ki-moon is committed to it. NAM partners and many more states have voiced their endorsement already in this Review Conference. All that is required is the political will to rid the world of nuclear weapons within the lifetime of the *hibakusha*. You have the power to forge that will. Please use that power for the sake of all future generations. We, the citizens of 4,000 cities round the world, especially the *hibakusha* in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, will do everything in our power to work with you to make our wishes a reality.

Together we can abolish nuclear weapons. Yes, we can!

Thank you.

The Mayor of Nagasaki's Statement

Drafted and delivered by Tomihisa Taue, Mayor of Nagasaki, Vice-President of Mayors for Peace

Mr. Chairman, delegates and leaders of citizens' groups: my name is Tomihisa Taue, Mayor of Nagasaki City. As the mayor of an atom-bombed city and the vice president of Mayors for Peace, I come here today to speak on behalf of citizens engaged in peace efforts.

We citizens have just one wish, and that is the realization of a world free of nuclear weapons.

To bring about this goal, atomic bomb survivors have been speaking out about their personal experiences. The survivors want the world to know that nuclear weapons must never be legitimized, for they are inhuman weapons of mass destruction. The four thousand mayors belonging to Mayors for Peace share this common goal. It is our top priority to continue appealing to the international community to eliminate nuclear weapons.

However, in the 65 years since the atomic bombings, nuclear-armed nations have ignored appeals for the abolishment of nuclear weapons. Instead they choose to pursue a security policy that relies on a nuclear deterrent. As a result, there are now enough nuclear weapons in the world to wipe out humanity many times over. Reliance on the power of nuclear weapons as a deterrent has increased the danger of terrorist organizations and unstable governments acquiring nuclear weapons, and has brought the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty to the brink of collapse.

The governments of countries that rely on nuclear deterrence must sincerely reflect on this paradox. We must face up to the reality that relying on nuclear deterrence has actually put the entire world at risk from these weapons. We must understand that the only way to free people from this threat and guarantee lasting international security is to realize a world free of nuclear weapons.

This April, the United States and Russia finally signed a nuclear arms control treaty in Prague initiating the process of reducing nuclear arms. We support these efforts, but also hope that the international community takes even greater steps forward under the leadership of the United Nations.

In 2008 U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki-moon proposed starting negotiations for a convention prohibiting nuclear weapons. At the 4th Nagasaki Global Citizens' Assembly for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons held in February of this year, participating NGOs from around the world expressed great interest in such a convention. In the Nagasaki Appeal 2010 they urged world leaders to support the proposal. It is time for the international community to start making sincere efforts towards a convention prohibiting nuclear weapons.

Arguments about nuclear weapons are usually made in terms of national interest, benefit to military industry or military effectiveness. However the one thing that must never be forgotten is the human point of view. Do the representatives of nuclear-armed nations truly realize the horror of the weapons they possess? Nuclear weapons burn human beings to ashes at temperatures of many thousands of degrees. They generate ferocious blast waves that smash and shatter bone. They release radiation that damages each and every cell in a victim's body. Today, 65 years after the atomic bombings, survivors still suffer from terrible illnesses caused by the aftereffects of the bombs. Can we honestly say we understand their endless suffering?

We must always consider nuclear weapons from this viewpoint. This is not just an issue for us now, but also for future generations. When talking about nuclear weapons, what always brings us back to the human point of view is hearing the voices of the atomic bomb survivors.

We must make the experiences of the atomic bomb survivors our touchstone. Once again, we must listen intently to their words, try to understand the depth of their feelings and realize why they call for "a world free of nuclear weapons."

I strongly hope that the delegates of each country work tirelessly to ensure the success of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference. Efforts must then be focused on the next step forward – a convention prohibiting nuclear weapons.