

FIRST COMMITTEE MONITOR

NGO Reporting on the United Nations
General Assembly First Committee on
Disarmament and International Security
7 October–5 November 2013

NO. 2
14 October 2013



FIRST COMMITTEE MONITOR

2013 No. 2

Reaching Critical Will | A programme of the
Women's International League for Peace and
Freedom

777 UN Plaza, 6th Floor, New York, NY 10017
ph. +1 212 682 1265 | fax +1 212 286 8211
contact: info@reachingcriticalwill.org

Editor: Ms. Ray Acheson

The views in this publication are not necessarily those of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom or the Reaching Critical Will programme.

Cover image: wallchan.com

Reaching Critical Will is the disarmament programme of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), the oldest women's peace organization in the world. Reaching Critical Will works for nuclear and conventional disarmament, the reduction of global military spending, and the demilitarization of politics and economics in order to achieve human security and social, economic, and environmental justice.

Reaching Critical Will is your primary source for information, documents, and analysis about the United Nations General Assembly First Committee and other multilateral disarmament conferences and processes.

On www.reachingcriticalwill.org you can find:

- A calendar of events for this First Committee;
- All editions of the *First Committee Monitor*;
- Statements, documents, and analysis from meetings of the First Committee, Conference on Disarmament, nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, Arms Trade Treaty, Programme of Action on small arms, and more;
- Research and analysis of critical issues related to disarmament and arms control; and
- News and information about civil society engagement on disarmament and arms control.

In this edition:

Editorial	3
Nuclear weapons	4
Biological and chemical weapons	5
WMD free zone in the Middle East	6
Outer space	8
High-tech weapons	9
Arms Trade Treaty.	9
Small arms and light weapons	11
Cluster munitions	12
Antipersonnel landmines.	12
Information technology and security	14
Disarmament machinery	14
Women, gender, and disarmament	16
Disarmament and development	17
Side event report: Nuclear Security Summit.	18
Side event report: The establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other WMD in the Middle East	18
Calendar of Events	19
Side event report: Steps towards a Middle East WMD free zone	20
Side event report: Cyber threats: information as a weapon?.	21
Side event report: Twenty years of renunciation of nuclear weapons by Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine: lessons learned and prospects of nuclear disarmament	22



Reaching Critical Will

EDITORIAL: THE HUMANITARIAN IMPERATIVE

Ray Acheson | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

Perhaps marking a change in tone of First Committee's typically repetitive and often grim outlook on the status of disarmament affairs, several delegations offered words of hope for progress during the first week of the general debate. The underlying motivation for progress seems to be the humanitarian and environmental consequences of weapons. Whether speaking about weapons of mass destruction (WMD) or conventional arms, delegations emphasized the need to prohibit their possession, restrict their availability, and/or prevent their use in order to achieve national, international, and human security.

In the case of WMD, countless delegations condemned the abhorrent and illegal use of chemical weapons in Syria. Many of these also noted that chemical weapons have been outlawed while nuclear weapons have not, and called for this situation to be rectified. Ambassador David Donoghue of Ireland argued that "as with chemical weapons, the days of nuclear weapons are also over." He emphasized how unacceptable and unsustainable it is that more than 17,000 nuclear weapons still exist while governments remain "mired in discussions about the conditions which must prevail before these weapons can be consigned to history along with the other weapons of mass destruction which humanity has already prohibited."

Not all states are ready for WMD to be "consigned to history," however. While Russia and the United States have cooperated to establish an agreement for the destruction of Syria's chemical weapons, neither country has met the deadline for the destruction of their own chemical arsenals. Furthermore, these two countries have the biggest nuclear weapon stockpiles. Both countries have expressed "concern" with the emerging discourse about the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons, with Russia's representative even complaining that this discussion "turns a difficult issue into public diplomacy" and is not in line with "true needs and priorities".

This argument, which matches the one heard previously by France, the United Kingdom, and the United States that the humanitarian discourse is a "distraction," has been repeatedly countered by non-nuclear armed states. As the New Agenda Coalition pointed out, pursuing initiatives that "hold the promise of progress" is entirely consistent with all states' obligation to advance nuclear disarmament. Furthermore, the idea that the public should not be involved in discussions about their survival and security is also unprincipled and unfounded. Chile's Ambassador Erráz-

zuriz rightly noted, "now that we have witnessed the horrendous humanitarian impact of weapons of mass destruction in Syria, nuclear disarmament requires a forceful intellectual and democratic campaign to delegitimize the most devastating of such weapons—nuclear arms."

The humanitarian discourse on nuclear weapons has changed the way governments and their publics address these weapons of terror. OPANAL, with its confidence that we will once again live in a world free of nuclear weapons, stated that "2013 has been a year when the colours of the rainbow began to mark the horizon of a world without nuclear weapons."

But as Liechtenstein and others noted last week, nuclear and chemical weapons are not the only threats to human security. The renewed focus on WMD "must not overshadow the fact that conventional weapons ... cause the vast majority of casualties in armed conflict, especially among civilians," cautioned Mr. Barriga of Liechtenstein. And while more progress can be seen at the diplomatic level on conventional weapon issues, serious challenges still remain in terms of concrete effects. While the adoption of the Arms Trade Treaty was largely hailed as a remarkable achievement that will help reduce and prevent human suffering caused by conventional weapons, most delegations also described it as only a first step towards achieving this goal. Likewise, while reaffirming support for the UN Programme of Action on small arms and light weapons, many delegations expressed concern with its non-legally-binding nature and subsequent failures in implementation.

In moving forward this month, delegates at First Committee must keep humanitarian principles in mind when discussing all weapon systems. "The increased focus on the well-being and security of the individual within our societies, as well as the discernible emphasis on IHL and the importance of abiding by its terms," is "good news," said Ambassador Higgie of New Zealand. But she also cautioned that when we fail to move forward, "it is almost always our individual citizens who are the ones to pay the price." •

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Mia Gandenberger | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

“[A] legally-binding and multilateral commitment to nuclear disarmament, backed by clearly defined timelines and benchmarks, is long overdue,” said Ambassador Khalil of Egypt speaking on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition (NAC). The majority of states joined the NAC during the first week of general debate in calling for concrete progress in nuclear disarmament. Chile, Ireland, Lesotho, Mexico, New Zealand, and others drew the connection between the recent use of chemical weapons in Syria and the need to eliminate nuclear weapons as the last weapon of mass destruction without a treaty prohibiting them. They pointed out that impact on the civilian population from the use of chemical weapons has been catastrophic, but that of nuclear weapons would be “infinitely more destructive,” as Ambassador Errázuriz of Chile pointed out.

To talk about or not talk about it...

NAC welcomed that the “renewed international focus on the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons has reinvigorated international efforts to achieve and maintain a world free of nuclear weapons.” Indeed, many states have raised the issue and welcomed the opportunity to discuss it in-depth at the conference in Oslo this past March as well as the follow-up to it in February 2014 in Nayarit, Mexico. In that context, the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) recognized humanitarian concerns as being among the “fundamental and global concerns.”

Mr. Uliyanov of the Russian Federation, however, expressed his country’s concern about the growing debate on the humanitarian consequences. He explained that his government is fully aware of the catastrophic consequences of the use of any type of nuclear weapons and there was “no need to talk about it”. Mr. Uliyanov cautioned that including these considerations would result in nuclear disarmament negotiations turning into “public diplomacy” and the “comprehensive context” approach would be marginalized.

However, Ambassador Octavio Errázuriz of Chile reminded states that civil society “cannot be relegated of democratic multilateralism”. He pointed out that in order to delegitimize and stigmatize nuclear weapons it is essential to create “strong currents of opinion” and to “generate the political conditions” needed for nuclear disarmament to succeed, for which the assistance of civil society is crucial. The focus on humanitarian and environmental implications of a nuclear weapons detonation could be a “valuable tool” to that end. Ambassador Donoghue of Ireland added that this would offer the opportunity to reframe the

debate about nuclear weapons as well as an impetus for achieving progress, because for far too long the international community has allowed “process to trump progress in nuclear disarmament negotiations.”

Reducing nuclear disarmament

Ambassador Mwinyi of Tanzania reminded First Committee of the initial motivation behind the demand for nuclear disarmament: the use of nuclear weapons during the Second World War. He regretted that disarmament has since then been reduced to arms control, leaving “a loose hole in the disarmament process”. His remarks were confirmed by the statements during the general debate by the representatives of the two states with the largest nuclear weapons arsenals, the United States and Russia. Both highlighted their progress made in the past on reducing the size of their stockpiles of nuclear weapons under different arms control agreements as well as reducing nuclear non-proliferation risks, but did not discuss actual nuclear disarmament or offer a proposal on how to achieve it.

Ms. Gottemoeller of the United States focused especially on the history of various nuclear test ban treaties such as the Limited Test Ban Treaty, the Threshold Test Ban Treaty, and the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty. However, her remarks on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, which for some delegations is a crucial instrument for nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, remained brief.

The representative of the Russian Federation, Mr. Uliyanov, stressed the fact that the destruction of one strategic missile would cost up to US\$1 million. He failed to mention the estimated price tag of US\$105 billion annually for the continued modernization of arsenals by all nuclear possessing states, which as NAC put it “is both unacceptable and unsustainable” in a world where “the basic needs of billion cannot be met”. In the same vein, NAM called on all nuclear-armed states “to immediately cease their plans to further modernize, upgrade, refurbish, or extend the lives of their nuclear weapons and related facilities.”

Ambassador Wu of China explained that the countries with the largest arsenals should continue to take the lead and then once the conditions were “ripe”, other nuclear-armed states should join negotiations on nuclear disarmament. The Russian representative argued that there is a balance in international relations, particularly with regard to military capabilities, and suggested that disturbing this balance might have negative effects. He went on to explain that current conditions are not yet conducive for further reduc-

tions of nuclear weapons, which was repeated by his US counterpart. Ambassador Donoghue of Ireland criticized such discussions about what conditions must prevail before nuclear disarmament can be achieved as “no longer sustainable and no longer acceptable.”

Growing gap

The decision to increase arsenals and develop other weapons of mass destruction “was not prompted by military might but by political and self aggrandizement considerations” by individuals “with certain ambitions, both political and strategic,” argued Ambassador Mwinyi of Tanzania. This ambition led to vast nuclear arsenals whose continued existence creates an illusion of security for those possessing them. However, it also leads to “insecurity for the vast majority because of the present danger of proliferation,” as the Chilean Ambassador indicated, as well as the risk of their use, intentionally or by accident. This continues to provide the grounds for wide criticism of lack of progress in nuclear disarmament. It also accentuates the growing gap between “increased awareness of the catastrophic consequences of nuclear weapons on the one hand, and the slow pace—if any—on achieving nuclear disarmament on the other,” as NAC put it.

One possible way forward raised by many states was the proposal NAM had introduced during the high-level meeting (HLM) on nuclear disarmament on 26 September 2013. It includes three parts: First, beginning negotiations on a comprehensive convention on nuclear weapons; second, declaring 26 September as the international day for the elimination of nuclear weapons; and third, convening an international conference on nuclear disarmament in 2018.

The plenary debate also included renewed calls for the universalization of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the implementation of the 2010 NPT review conference outcome document, the ratification and timely entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, legally-binding negative security assurances, the commencement of negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty, and affirmations of the right to peaceful uses of nuclear energy under article IV of the NPT. Many states also highlighted the significance of nuclear weapon free zones for nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. The HLM on nuclear disarmament was widely welcomed as an opportunity to exchange views on this crucial issue. •

BIOLOGICAL AND CHEMICAL WEAPONS

Mia Gandenberger | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

The recent use of chemical weapons in Syria led to increased attention on this issue during the first week of general debate of this year’s First Committee. The majority of states expressed their deep concern over the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of the use of such weapons and called for those responsible for the attacks in Syria to be prosecuted, emphasizing that any use of chemical weapons violations international law. In this context, Danish Ambassador Balslev noted that while the mandate of the UN investigation had not been to determine the perpetrators, “the sheer amount of proof that exists in addition to the report points to the likely perpetrators. Use of chemical weapons is a war crime and there should be no impunity.”

Most states welcomed UN Security Council resolution 2118 (2013), which determined that the use of chemical weapon anywhere constitutes a threat to international peace and security. They also welcomed the decision by the Executive Council of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) of 27 September, which contains special procedures for the destruction of Syria’s chemical weapons. Many states also highlighted the importance of the UN investigation to determine whether chemical weapons

had been used as well as the joint UN-OPCW effort to oversee the destruction of Syrian chemical weapons.

The Syrian Ambassador in his statement joined his colleagues in condemning the use of chemical weapons in his country and stressed that the perpetrators must be held accountable. Based on the fact that the use of weapons of mass destruction is immoral and condemnable, and in light of recent developments and for its own security, his country has joined the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). In the beginning of September Syria had submitted papers to accede to the CWC, which was welcomed by the majority of states. However, Turkey stressed that “the Syrian regime must abide by its promises” and stipulated that non-compliance with the CWC as well as the UN Security Council resolution would have consequences.

With regard to the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC), NAM states parties to the Convention lamented the lack of a verification system and called for the resumption of negotiations for a legally-binding verification protocol. Many states also called for the universalization of this instrument, as the use and proliferation of biological and toxic agents pose a comparable risk to that of chemical weapons. •

WMD FREE ZONE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Jacqueline Treboschi | NGO Committee on Disarmament, Peace and Security

The establishment of a weapons of mass destruction free zone in the Middle East (MEWMDFZ) was consistently addressed through the opening week of First Committee. Numerous countries as well as the UN High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Ms. Angela Kane, expressed hopeful views for the establishment of a MEWMDFZ. Libya's representative stated that the establishment of zones of this nature is a step in the right direction toward ridding the world of the dangers posed by weapons of mass destruction (WMD).

Along with delegates' statements of optimism, however, were numerous expressions of disappointment regarding the indefinite postponement of an interna-

tional conference on creating this zone. According to guidelines set in place by the 1995 Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference, such a meeting was to take place during 2012. It appeared as if this mandate would be fulfilled when the conference was scheduled to be held during December 2012 with Finland as the hosting country. However, the conference never materialized leaving many states concerned for the future of the international conference and the goal of eliminating WMD in the region.

A number of countries whose statements discussed the MEWMDFZ expressed both regret regarding the postponement of the conference and hopes that it will be held as soon as possible. Many delegations also



PERMANENT MISSION OF THE
REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA
TO THE UNITED NATIONS
NEW YORK



Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft
Confédération suisse
Confederazione Svizzera
Confederaziun svizra

Swiss Confederation



Reaching Critical Will

Article 36

The humanitarian initiative to prohibit nuclear weapons

Thursday, 17 October 2013
13:15-14:30

Conference Room A
Conference Building

Light lunch will be served

Speakers

Ambassador Desra Percaya, Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the United Nations
Thomas Nash, Director of Article 36
Beatrice Fihn, Programme Manager of Reaching Critical Will of WILPF
Greg Mello, Executive Director of the Los Alamos Study Group
Susi Snyder, Nuclear Disarmament Programme Leader for IKV Pax Christi

This event is sponsored by the Permanent Mission of Indonesia to the United Nations and the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs together with Reaching Critical Will and Article 36 with the participation of the Los Alamos Study Group and IKV Pax Christi



stated their strong overall support for the establishment of such a zone. Representatives from the Arab Group, African Group, Brazil, and others not only lamented the delay of the conference, but insisted that a new time be designated before the end of the year. Aims for a timely resolution to this issue were expressed by several countries. However, despite these assurances of support, many delegates provided few, if any, concrete suggestions for moving forward with the planning of the international conference and the establishment of the MEWMDZF.



Though he did not specify an outlined course of action, the ambassador of Spain argued that a pragmatic, step-by-step approach to deciding a date for the international conference and establishing the MEWMDZF is the best plan for the near future. The Egyptian delegation seemed to share this view, but also provided an outline for achieving this goal. Its proposed course of action was as follows: First, all countries in the Middle East region along with the five permanent member states of the UN Security Council should be invited to write letters to the UN Secretary General stating their support for the MEWMDZF. The second stipulation called for regional countries that have not acceded to international conventions on WMD to do so before the end of 2013. Third, efforts should be made to host the conference by the end of 2012, or in early 2014 at the latest.

Egyptian Ambassador Mootaz Khalil also specifically cited Israel as a primary challenge in establishing the MEWMDZF thus far, and was not the only speaker to do so. The Non-Aligned Movement demanded that Israel renounce its nuclear weapons in order to move further towards successfully implementing a MEWMDZF, and delegates from the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, and others urged Israel to sign the NPT. The Saudi Arabian representative, Ambassador Abdallah Y. Al-Mouallimi, argued that it is the responsibility especially of Israel to work toward organizing a conference on this matter before the end of this year. Syrian Ambassador Bashar Ja'afari argued that until Israel agrees to eliminate its nuclear weapons and joins all conventions that outlaw the use of WMD, the possibility for the MEWMDZF will not exist. In the view of Syria, the presence of nuclear weapons in Israel is a catalyst for regional instability and insecurity,

which will continue to inhibit progress until their eradication.

The necessity of dedication from all Middle Eastern states toward establishing the MEWMDZF was reiterated by the delegation of Qatar, which also raised another important issue. The delay of the international conference could serve to remove some sense of legitimacy from the NPT. The Non-Aligned Movement specified this concern in its statement as well, asserting that further delay of progress in this area could have a negative impact on the credibility of the NPT, therefore that the success of the 2015 NPT Review Conference.

Considering the real progress toward WMD abolishment that could be facilitated by the establishment of a MEWMDZF, the organization of this conference should be of great interest to every member state of the UN, as well as civil society. Though a number of countries have sincerely expressed their hopes for the resolution of the issues surrounding the establishment of the MEWMDZF, the majority will have to move beyond these formulaic sentiments to pragmatic and urgent conversation on strategy. •

 Schweizerische Eidgenossenschaft Confédération suisse Confederazione Svizzera Confederaziun svizra Swiss Confederation	 NEW ZEALAND
The Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs & The New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade	
<i>invite you to a discussion on:</i>	
<h2>Nuclear Weapons and International Law</h2>	
Friday, 18 October 13:15 – 14:45	
Conference Room 7, North Lawn Building	
<i>With</i>	
Andrew Clapham Professor of International Law; Director, Geneva Academy of IHL and HR	
Roger S. Clark Professor of International Law, Rutgers School of Law, New Jersey	
Daniel Thürer Professor of International Law (Em.), University of Zurich; Member, ICRC Assembly	

OUTER SPACE

Adam Wolf | NGO Committee on Disarmament, Peace and Security

Outer space continues to be one of the emerging realms of security challenges that will have to be addressed by the international community. This week's First Committee statements demonstrated that a potential arms race in outer space is something that is of great concern.

The representative of the European Union (EU) was the first to bring forth the issue, welcoming the outcome of the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Transparency and Confidence-Building Measures (TCBMs) in Outer Space Activities held in July of 2013. The outcome of the GGE on TCBMs was further welcomed by the Russian Federation and China later in the week, both stating that they were each deeply involved in the consensus report. Additionally, the EU stated that it has revised its International Code of Conduct for Outer Space Activities (ICOC) and will hold consultations from 20–22 November 2013 in Thailand. Other delegations, such as Ukraine, also voiced support for further consultations for the ICOC, which it hosted in May 2013.

Bangladesh, and Nigeria on behalf of the African Group, noted that outer space represents humankind's "common heritage". This principle is highlighted in the 1967 Treaty of Outer Space Affairs. Attributing outer space as humankind's common heritage means that no state or entity, under international law, can assert its national sovereignty on the moon or in any celestial bodies. To countries that might lack future outer space capabilities, it is clear that associating outer space as common heritage will be important in ensuring that whoever will possess such capabilities will do so in a manner that is peaceful, transparent, and responsible. Bangladesh emphasized that in ensuring international security, space faring nations must avoid placing weapons in outer space.

Other delegations also seemed interested in directly addressing "weaponization" of outer space. The Russian Federation and China presented their concerns about preventing an arms race in outer space and emphasized the need for an international instrument that concisely addresses such an issue. China referenced the draft Treaty on the Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space, jointly submitted by China and the Russian Federation to the Conference on Disarmament in 2008. China welcomed all delegations to in-depth discussions on the draft treaty in order to further improve its text. Further support for an international instrument to prevent an arms race in outer space was echoed by Qatar.

Applications and uses of outer space still remain highly ambiguous and dynamic. Such applications are however limited to a handful of member states, leading to imbalanced priorities and discussions over the issue. As evidenced by this week, states will continue to move forward in setting the framework for transparency and accountability in outer space. The EU ICOC remains to be one of the most discussed frameworks on the issue thus far. For most countries, however, a treaty on preventing weapons placement in outer space will prove vital for future prospects for outer space security. •

5–12 OCTOBER 2013 WAS THE INTERNATIONAL WEEK OF PROTEST TO STOP THE MILITARIZATION OF SPACE

SEE WWW.SPACE4PEACE.ORG

KEEP SPACE FOR PEACE



OCTOBER 5-12, 2013

Satellites: The Triggers for Surveillance & Endless War

Virtually all warfare on the planet today is directed by military space satellites. The US currently has more than 100 active military satellites. Ground stations around the globe, including at the North and South poles, download images from the satellites that are used by the military for spying and offensive operations. This massively expensive space control system helps deliver death from the sky as drones kill innocents in Afghanistan, Pakistan and on the African continent. Cutsbacks in social programs are being made in order to pay for this space-directed war.

Help us call for an end to the militarization of space and destruction of social progress. Organize a local action during Keep Space for Peace Week.

International Week of Protest to Stop the Militarization of Space

Global Network Against Weapons & Nuclear Power in Space
www.space4peace.org • 207.443.9502
Sponsored by:
Women's International League for Peace & Freedom www.ReachingCriticalWill.org
Drones Campaign Network (DC) www.dronewarriors.net
Know Drones (JEF) www.KnowDrones.com

Local Contact:

HIGH-TECH WEAPONS

Tereza Steinhublova | Global Action to Prevent War

For the purposes of this article, high-tech weapons include missiles, anti-missile systems, armed drones, and fully autonomous weapons. During the first week of general debate, minimal attention was given to these weapon systems. Unfortunately, none of the member states giving statements last week addressed the use of armed drones.

Missiles

While discussion of missiles was minimal, the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) called for a “non-discriminatory approach toward the issue of missiles within the UN,” emphasizing that “any initiative on this subject should take into account the security concerns of all states and their right to peaceful uses of space technologies.”

Much of the debate surrounding the use and development of ballistic missiles focused on the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK). Representatives of Japan and the European Union urged the DPRK to abandon its ballistic missile programme. Ambassador Toshio Sano of Japan argued that the DPRK’s missile programme is a “serious violations of relevant Security Council resolutions.” This invoked a right of reply from the DPRK’s representative, who stressed that Japan had also used ballistic missiles to deploy satellites into outer space, but was not subjected to the same response by the Security Council as the DPRK.

Anti-missile systems

Anti-missile systems received very little attention in the general debate. NAM expressed concern “over the de-

velopments related to the anti-ballistic missile systems” and called for the “commencement of negotiations in the [Conference on Disarmament (CD)]”. Ambassador Wu Haitao of the People’s Republic of China argued that missile defence systems, which “undermine global strategic balance and stability,” ought to be discontinued. Russia’s representative likewise argued that the unilateral deployment of anti-ballistic missile systems is a challenge to nuclear disarmament.

Fully autonomous weapons

Two states raised the issue of fully autonomous weapons or ‘killer robots’ during the opening week. The delegations of Egypt and France expressed concern over the ethical implications and questions of the compliance of these weapons with international humanitarian law (IHL). The prominent question arising in debates around ‘killer robots’ is the extent of the human decision to use lethal weapons. This was underscored by both delegations.

A key theme present in the debate regarding fully autonomous weapons was the need to carry out further research before engaging in the development, deployment, or use of these types of weapons. Ambassador Jean-Hugues Simon-Michel of France called for discussions on these weapon systems to be held in an “appropriate disarmament forum, combining the necessary military, legal and technical expertise and all the states concerned.” Similarly, Ambassador Mootaz Khalil of Egypt underlined the need for the creation of appropriate regulations prior to the use of these types of weapons. •

ARMS TRADE TREATY

Emma Ensign | Control Arms

During the opening of the UNGA First Committee’s general debate many states took the opportunity to highlight the massive success of the recent adoption of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), and their commitment to its rapid entry into force. Citing the “disappointments, unfulfilled commitments and common frustrations” that often riddle the arms control and disarmament agenda, Angela Kane, the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, noted the ATT was “the undoubted highlight of the year,” and would help establish global norms. The majority of states that mentioned the ATT in their statements echoed this sentiment, with many describing its adoption as a “landmark achievement”.

In discussing support for the Treaty, many states remarked on its ability to “level the playing field” by requiring states to adhere to “robust and effective” common standards for the regulation of the arms trade. Speaking on behalf of the European Union, Mr. Jacek Bylica commended the “multilateral framework for transparency and accountability” that the ATT will foster. Praise for the humanitarian objective of the ATT was a central focus of several interventions, particularly among states affected by armed violence. A strong statement from Jamaica on behalf of CARICOM stressed the importance of the Treaty in reducing armed gender-based violence in the future, and applauded the Treaty’s ability to reduce human suf-

continued on next page

fering for those living under the devastating impact of the global arms trade.

Colombia's delegation spoke of strengthening and implementing the ATT as being a "matter of survival" for developing countries. Others welcomed the comprehensive inclusion of international humanitarian law and human rights in the criteria of the Treaty. Some states made specific reference to areas of the Treaty that they found particularly important. Colombia, Mongolia, Turkey, and Tunisia, for example, welcomed the explicit inclusion of small arms and light weapons in the Treaty, citing the proliferation of small arms in exacerbating conflicts and threatening social and economic development.

There were multiple calls from governments urging all remaining states to sign and ratify the ATT, with some, such as the African Group, specifically identifying the participation of major exporters and importers as being critical to the Treaty's success. France, Switzerland, Ireland, Slovenia, Brazil, Hungary, Lesotho, Bangladesh, Estonia, Uruguay, Montenegro, Zambia, and the EU all outlined their imminent ratification plans, while Kazakhstan, Thailand, and the Maldives indicated their intention to sign soon. Estonia also indicated its plan to submit a declaration of provisional application of articles 6 and 7, joining Mexico, Costa Rica, and Trinidad and Tobago, who had previously identified their plan to apply articles 6 and 7 prior to entry-into-force during the high-level panel on the ATT held on 25 September.

The paramount importance of effective and robust implementation of the Treaty was underscored by many. States cited effective implementation as one of the primary ways to protect civilians and prevent human suffering. Importantly, Switzerland noted its creation of a model interpretive declaration on certain provisions, which it offered to share with interested parties, underscoring the importance of strongly interpreting the Treaty's obligations so as to set more robust global norms. Switzerland and Trinidad and Tobago both reiterated their interest in hosting the proposed ATT Secretariat, and outlined their respective qualifications to do so.

Both donor countries and states affected by armed violence stressed the importance of providing adequate resources and assistance to all countries to allow for effective implementation. The ambassador of Denmark noted it was important "to ensure that the cost and administrative burden of implementation does not discourage developing countries, often the most affected, from joining the treaty." To this end, Denmark re-iterated its contribution of 1.7 million USD to support "capacity building initiatives," most nota-

bly through the UNSCAR Trust Facility, and encouraged other states to "donate generously to this live saving effort." Australia's delegation also highlighted the importance of UNSCAR as a means to promote implementation, while the representative of the EU announced the creation of an EU ATT Implementation Assistance Program, which would lend legal expertise and technical assistance to third world countries.

Australia, Burkina Faso, Denmark, and Mexico mentioned the synchronicity between the ATT and other frameworks such as the UN Programme of Action on small arms and the Wassenaar Arrangement. They advocated that states promote synergies between these processes in order to foster complimentary and compatible disarmament legislation, make use of existing structures, and share best practices and accumulated knowledge.

Some states continued to criticize the ATT for not being "balanced," including Indonesia, Cuba, and India. However, New Zealand's ambassador highlighted the use of UNGA rules during the negotiations process, which it said, prevented the will of a few from trumping "the interests of the vast majority."

Looking ahead to the remainder of the First Committee, Australia announced that the co-authors (Argentina, Australia, Costa Rica, Finland, Japan, Kenya, the United Kingdom) will present a resolution that will "promote further signatures and ratifications of the treaty and its rapid entry-into-force." They invited all member states to support the resolution, which also calls on states in a position to do so to provide assistance to requesting states that need help with implementation. •

Signature and Ratification

**HOW MANY STATES HAVE
SIGNED THE ATT? 113**

**HOW MANY STATES HAVE
RATIFIED THE ATT? 7**

SMALL ARMS AND LIGHT WEAPONS

Marianne Rijke | Global Action to Prevent War

During the first week of the First Committee, most of the attention was focused on nuclear weapons, chemical weapons, and the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT). But the subject of small arms and light weapons (SALW) also received a fair amount of attention. For the most part, states emphasized their concern with the illicit trade of SALW and with the manufacture and accumulation of SALW and its ammunition.

The ambassador of Botswana called the illicit trafficking in SALW one of the greatest challenges of our time and several delegations, including those of Spain, Uruguay, and Chile, described SALW as another form of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) because they kill over half a million people per year. The illicit trade in SALW is known to have a wide range of security, humanitarian and socioeconomic consequences. Ms. Angela Kane, High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, referred to these consequences as including “the prolongation and fueling of conflicts, the setting back of social and economic development, the aggravation of threats to peacekeepers, and the fueling of regional instability.”

The main cause for this, as pointed out by the ambassadors of Tunisia and Qatar and the Director of the First United Nations Division (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) of Nigeria, is the low regulation and the lack of control and restrictions for exporters of SALW. The ambassador of Indonesia, who spoke on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), called upon states to ensure that the supply of SALW is limited to governments and authorized entities. The ambassador of Syria argued that some producers of SALW are involved in transfers to terrorist and illegal groups to undermine the stability of entire countries or regions in order to serve the geopolitical and economic interests of these states. “This is what happened in Syria,” the Ambassador declared. During the General Assembly high-level debate the majority of UN member states called for an end to the violence on all sides, and repeated calls have been for the halting of arms flows to any party to the conflict.

The need to sustain political will and momentum to end the illicit trade of SALW was underlined by the Director General (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) of Nepal and the ambassador of Jamaica, who spoke on behalf of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM). The NAM stated that emphasis should be put on strengthening international cooperation and assistance and the ambassador of Tunisia added that there should be a big role for international organizations. The importance of a leading role of First Committee in strengthening

norms in the conventional weapons field was stressed by the ambassador of the Republic of Korea.

The first ever UN Security Council resolution dedicated to the question of SALW (UNSCR 2117), adopted on 26 September 2013, was highlighted by many present as a step forward to greater control over SALW. Ms. Kane stated that “the resolution underscores the vital need for cooperation and exchange of information between UN peacekeeping operations, UN missions in the field, relevant sanctions committees, groups of experts, and member states.” The ambassador of the Republic of Korea underlined that the UNSCR 2117 reconfirms several key points regarding SALW, including Security Council-mandated arms embargoes and the implementation of the UN Programme of Action (UNPoA).

The UNPoA was referred to by many states, including Tunisia, Myanmar, and South Africa, as being the key framework to prevent, combat, and eliminate illicit trade in SALW. The outcome document of the 2012 UNPoA Review Conference (RevCon) was hailed as a success by several states. However, many delegations also emphasized the need for balanced, full, and effective implementation of the UNPoA and the International Tracing Instrument (ITI). The ambassador of Lesotho stated that the UNPoA can not yet be seen as a success since it is not legally-binding, which poses a challenge for its implementation. The ambassador of Botswana called upon cooperating partners to “provide technical support and capacity building to boost national implementation efforts” and the ambassador of Tunisia called upon all member states to voluntarily submit national reports every two years on the progress of the implementation of the UNPoA.

Several states welcomed the upcoming fifth Biennial Meeting of States (BMS5) to consider the UNPoA, which will be held from 16–20 June 2014. CARICOM shared its hope that the BMS5 will strengthen global action on SALW. The ambassador of Mexico added that “states should take advantage of the BMS5 to promote synergies between the ATT, the PoA, and other similar processes to strengthen regional and global measures.” •

CLUSTER MUNITIONS

Amelie Chayer | International Campaign to Ban Landmines – Cluster Munition Coalition

The global rejection of cluster munitions was once again clearly highlighted during the general debate of the First Committee, with 16 states plus the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) taking the floor to express their views on the weapon.

Thirteen states party to the Convention on Cluster Munitions (CCM) spoke about the weapon, emphasizing its unacceptable consequences on civilians and noting the importance of the CCM as a remedy.

Australia, a major donor to demining and other mine action efforts, recognized the tragic impact of the weapon on civilians and urged “continued harnessing of national and international assistance and cooperation” to further universalize and implement the Convention. The ambassador of Chile welcomed the CCM as progress in the regulation of conventional weapons, and noted his government’s intention to host a regional seminar on the issue for Latin American and Caribbean states in December 2013.

France’s ambassador emphasized that while the use of chemical weapons by the Syrian regime was terrifying, the Syrian population also suffered from other violations of international humanitarian law, “including through other unacceptable weapons, in particular cluster munitions.” The ambassador of Ireland also regretted the deeply worrying reports of cluster munition use in the past year, while Switzerland expressed deep concern with the use of cluster munitions in Syria and recalled that international law requires that all necessary measures be taken to protect the civilian population. The representative of Nicaragua likewise noted the impact of cluster munitions on civilian populations, including women and children.

Iraq reaffirmed its commitment to fully implement the CCM. Lao PDR, the world’s most heavily affected state, encouraged all states to join the Convention and stressed that these weapons constitute a threat to peace, human security, and development as a whole. Lebanon, whose demining efforts are well underway, deplored the death of innocent civilians due to cluster munition contamination. Liechtenstein, an important financial center, explained that its domestic legislation prohibits the direct and indirect funding of cluster munition production.

The ambassador of Mexico said it was well-known that “only a minority of States” still refused to adhere to the prohibition on a range of weapons including cluster munitions. In a particularly strong statement, New Zealand’s ambassador emphasized that the norm against cluster munitions “already has considerable force on the international stage” as demonstrated by the vast condemnation of cluster munition use in Syria. Zambia, as President of the recent Fourth Meeting of States Parties (4MSP) to the CCM, spoke about the powerful norm created by the Convention and urged all states to come on board.

Colombia, a signatory to the convention, expressed hope to complete its ratification process before next year’s First Committee. It noted the grave consequences of cluster munition use, including their impact on socioeconomic development. South Africa, also a signatory, expressed concern about the impact of use and reiterated its commitment to the implementation of all provisions of the CCM. Qatar, a non-signatory, noted that cluster munitions wreak havoc. ASEAN recognized the adverse humanitarian impact of cluster munitions and noted the important work of 4MSP. •

ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINES

Amelie Chayer | International Campaign to Ban Landmines – Cluster Munition Coalition

Fourteen years into the life of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction (or Mine Ban Treaty, MBT), the instrument remains a shining star of disarmament and is on the UN Treaty Section’s list of global treaties that are close to universal participation.

Nineteen states plus the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) used the general debate of First Committee to share their views on antipersonnel mines and the MBT.

Australia’s representative emphasized the tragic impact of antipersonnel mines on civilians and urged “continued harnessing of national and international cooperation and assistance” towards a mine-free world. Ireland’s ambassador said reports of use of antipersonnel mines in the past year were deeply worrying, while Bangladesh’s ambassador reaffirmed his government’s commitment to put an end to landmine use. The ambassador of Switzerland expressed deep concern with the use of antipersonnel mines in the Syrian conflict and called on all parties to ensure the protection of civilians. On behalf of ASEAN, the

ambassador of Myanmar recognized “the adverse humanitarian impact” of landmine use.

Both Chile and Ecuador noted their full support to the MBT. Colombia offered to share with other states its expertise on assistance to landmine victims, and announced it would host an international conference on victim assistance issues on 3–4 April 2014. Thailand, noting that it still experiences the impact of landmine contamination, referred to an international symposium it hosted in June 2013 that highlighted the need for continued international cooperation and assistance in addressing the scourge of landmines. Estonia announced that it would continue to increase its financial contributions to humanitarian demining, and also called on all states to join the MBT. China, a state not party to the MBT, explained that over time it has provided various forms of assistance to humanitarian demining activities in some 40 countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The representative of Hungary announced that the clearance of a newly discovered contaminated area at the border with Croatia was completed in late September 2013 and that a formal declaration of completion would be made at the next Meeting of States Parties of the MBT. Iraq’s delegation reaffirmed its commitment to fully implement the MBT and Jordan spoke about its efforts to implement the MBT. Liechtenstein explained that its national legislation prohibits the direct and indirect funding of antipersonnel mine production.

New Zealand’s ambassador emphasized that the MBT is “an essential instrument” of international humanitarian law. Mexico said it was well-known that “only a minority of States” still refused to adhere to the prohibition on a range of weapons including antipersonnel mines. Nicaragua recalled that Central America became the first mine-free region in 2010 upon completion of Nicaragua’s demining programme. Qatar regretted that landmines still wreak havoc. Slovenia, as President of the Twelfth Meeting of States Parties (12MSP) to the MBT held in December 2012, called on states to vote in favour of the draft resolution on the implementation of the MBT that it will submit to the First Committee together with Algeria and Cambodia. The Syrian population also suffered from other violations of international humanitarian law, “including through other unacceptable weapons, in particular cluster munitions.” The ambassador of Ireland also regretted the deeply worrying reports of cluster munition use in the past year, while Switzerland expressed deep concern with the use of cluster munitions in Syria and recalled that international law requires that all necessary measures be taken to protect the civilian population. The representative of Nicaragua likewise

noted the impact of cluster munitions on civilian populations, including women and children.

Iraq reaffirmed its commitment to fully implement the CCM. Lao PDR, the world’s most heavily affected state, encouraged all states to join the Convention and stressed that these weapons constitute a threat to peace, human security, and development as a whole. Lebanon, whose demining efforts are well underway, deplored the death of innocent civilians due to cluster munition contamination. Liechtenstein, an important financial center, explained that its domestic legislation prohibits the direct and indirect funding of cluster munition production.

The ambassador of Mexico said it was well-known that “only a minority of States” still refused to adhere to the prohibition on a range of weapons including cluster munitions. In a particularly strong statement, New Zealand’s ambassador emphasized that the norm against cluster munitions “already has considerable force on the international stage” as demonstrated by the vast condemnation of cluster munition use in Syria. Zambia, as President of the recent Fourth Meeting of States Parties (4MSP) to the CCM, spoke about the powerful norm created by the Convention and urged all states to come on board.

Colombia, a signatory to the convention, expressed hope to complete its ratification process before next year’s First Committee. It noted the grave consequences of cluster munition use, including their impact on socioeconomic development. South Africa, also a signatory, expressed concern about the impact of use and reiterated its commitment to the implementation of all provisions of the CCM. Qatar, a non-signatory, noted that cluster munitions wreak havoc. ASEAN recognized the adverse humanitarian impact of cluster munitions and noted the important work of 4MSP. •



INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND SECURITY

John Burroughs | Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy

During the first week of general debate, several governments pointed to the need to develop a legal framework for cyber security. In this regard, the delegations of Australia and Estonia welcomed the consensus report released in June 2013 of the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security (A/68/98). Senator Chris Back of Australia, which chaired the GGE, said that the “recommendation, on norms, rules and principles of responsible behavior by States—that ‘international law, and in particular the Charter of the United Nations, is applicable’—is an important breakthrough.”

Also on the theme of the need for a legal framework, Chinese Ambassador Wu Haitao stated that work is now underway on updating the draft International Code of Conduct for Information Security (A/66/35) put forward by China, Russia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan in 2011. He commented: “Cyberspace is neither an enclave without law nor the jungle where the law of jungle applies.”

The Non-Aligned Movement and Georgia made general calls for development of a legal framework. Ambassador Kaha Imnadze of Georgia, which experienced disruptive cyber attacks during the 2008 South Ossetia war, stated that he doubts we understand the potential impacts of such attacks in a globalized world

and consequently “we lack necessary instruments to adequately respond to the challenges.”

Brazil and Ecuador’s delegations raised the role of cyber operations in surveillance and espionage, interventions no doubt sparked by Edward Snowden’s release of documents about US operations. On behalf of Brazil, Ambassador Guilherme de Aguiar Patriota expressed “deep concern about recent revelations concerning the activities of a global network of electronic espionage aimed at indiscriminately intercepting communications and data from citizens, businesses and members of governments.” He continued: “Such unacceptable practices constitute serious threats to national sovereignty and individual rights, besides being incompatible with democratic coexistence between friendly countries.”

Ambassador Oh Joon of the Republic of Korea announced that the Seoul Conference on Cyberspace 2013 will be held on October 17 and 18, with the theme of “Global Prosperity through an Open and Secure Cyberspace”. He said that as “cyber terrorism transcends national boundaries, global cooperation is indispensable to recognize and address such cyber threats.” In March of this year, cyber attacks paralyzed computers and servers of South Korean banks and broadcasters, and in June such attacks shut down websites of the presidential office and the ruling party. •

DISARMAMENT MACHINERY

Beatrice Fihn | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

As always, the state of the disarmament machinery was a hot topic during the first week of the general debate. Many delegations voiced complaints about the lack of progress in the Conference on Disarmament (CD), though a few also issued cautiously positive comments about its recent decision to establish an informal working group on a programme of work. However, the majority of delegation expressed disappointment that the stalemate in multilateral disarmament negotiations has continued for yet another year.

But some delegations felt that the ongoing stalemate also provides opportunities. The Brazilian ambassador suggested that the failures of the UN disarmament machinery should bring governments to look at collective security mechanisms overall and to discuss “in particular, the role of the Security Council and its

ability to overcome the logic of the so-called strategic stability among its permanent members, which has a clear impact on the whole peace and security system, including on the work of the CD and of this First Committee.”

Meanwhile, the success of other initiatives helps provide some insight to the stalemate in traditional fora. For example, the ambassador New Zealand noted that the adoption of the Arms Trade Treaty only happened because the rules of procedure were broadly based on General Assembly practices rather than those of the CD. “In this process, at least,” she noted, “the will of the very few has not been allowed to trump the interests of the vast majority.”

The ongoing deadlock in the traditional machinery has also led to other new opportunities. For as many



delegations that complained about the CD's stalemate, there were an equal number of delegations welcoming the new initiatives. UN High-Representative for Disarmament Affairs Angela Kane noted the "outpouring of international recognition this year of the humanitarian consequences of the use of nuclear weapons." She noted that this was a featured theme at the conference in Oslo in March and at two special UN initiatives focused on nuclear disarmament, the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) in Geneva and the High-Level Meeting (HLM) in New York. She noted that this perspective "offers an auspicious sign for future progress in disarmament."

The OEWG and the HLM dominated the discussions on disarmament machinery. CARICOM, Switzerland, Ireland, Malaysia, ASEAN, South Africa, Slovenia, Philippines, Denmark, Georgia, Ecuador, Chile, Nigeria, New Zealand, and Colombia all welcomed the convening and conclusion of the OEWG. The Swiss delegation expressed conviction that further and deeper explorations of some of the proposals in its final report could bring additional value and complement other efforts on nuclear disarmament, and Denmark noted that it had been very successful in conceptualizing new approaches and defining differences that should be bridged. New Zealand expressed appreciation that the OEWG provided for an opportunity to explore the implications of nuclear weapons for international humanitarian law, and the Slovenian delegation called for a new mandate for 2014.

The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), CARICOM, the African Group, Japan, Turkey, Egypt, Ireland, Malaysia, Algeria, ASEAN, South Africa, Philippines, Brazil, Lesotho, Denmark, Uruguay, Chile, Nigeria, New Zealand, Mongolia, Indonesia, Cuba, Venezuela, Colombia, and Bangladesh all welcomed the convening of the HLM. Many appreciated the opportunity to demonstrate their commitment to nuclear disarmament at a high-level for the first time. The Indonesian representative called it an "unprecedented gathering of world leaders and functionaries of government and civil society at the UN where they reinvigorated their resolve to rid the world of nuclear weapons."

The NAM, the African Group, and many of the two groups' member states called for 26 September to be designated an international day for the elimination of nuclear weapons, and want to convene an international conference on nuclear disarmament in 2018 to review progress made pursuant to the HLM.

However, not all states were as enthusiastic about these new developments. The European Union, with two nuclear-armed states in the group, managed only to note that the OEWG and the HLM "took place,"

but failed to provide any additional thoughts on them.

Obviously less than thrilled with recent initiatives, the French ambassador noted that his delegation had warned the General Assembly last year "of the probable consequences of certain initiatives which created parallel forums." He expressed concern that "as we feared, the reopening of discussions on the step-by-step approach as the next negotiating priority" has endangered the 2010 NPT Action Plan.

China was equally concerned and complained that these "new kitchens" that are being set up "only weakens the authority of the existing mechanisms, disperse precious resources, and proves counterproductive to nuclear disarmament."

While not singling out any specific meeting, the Russian delegation instead criticized the entire humanitarian approach by arguing it had turned "a difficult issue" such as nuclear weapons into "public diplomacy".

However, just as last year, these delegations were much less critical about moving outside traditional structures when it comes to fissile materials. The EU noted that all its member states had supported A/RES/67/53, which establishes a group of governmental experts (GGE) on a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT). France also expressed hope that this new body would make "important progress" in 2014 and 2015. While not sounding exactly enthusiastic about the idea, China argued that the GGE should include the major producers of fissile material for nuclear weapons, and "strictly comply with the principle of consensus."

The first week of general debate signaled that we can no longer expect business as usual. Last year, several initiatives like the OEWG, the HLM and the GGE were initiated. This year, concrete results have been achieved and both the OEWG and the HLM were considered successful events. For the remainder of the First Committee, it is now time to evaluate this year's accomplishments and consider what needs to be done next year. •

WOMEN, GENDER, AND DISARMAMENT

Sofia Tuvestad | Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Swedish Section

2013 has seen substantial progress in advancing gender equality within the area of disarmament and arms control. Prior to the opening of this year's First Committee, WILPF has thus been calling on member states to acknowledge these steps and promote further progress. This can be done, e.g., by highlighting the strong gender provisions in the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) and recognizing the particular impact that the illicit trade of small arms and light weapons (SALW), as well as the use of explosive weapons in populated areas, have on women. We have also called on states to identify ways to strengthen and improve UN General Assembly resolution 67/48 "Women, disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation".

Angela Kane, the UN High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, pointed out in her opening statement on 7 October that the gender provisions of the Security Council Resolution 2117 (2013) on small arms and light weapons (SALW) deserve attention at the First Committee. Looking back at the general debate, however, most member states did not include any references to this aspect of the resolution, nor to any other gender aspects of disarmament or arms control. The only statement to stand out in this regard was delivered by Ambassador Courtenay Rattray of Jamaica, on behalf of the Caribbean Community (CARICOM). CARICOM's statement referred to the ATT provision on preventing armed gender-based violence and underlined the "high importance" of "the participation of women in all decision-making processes with regard to matters related to disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control, and in particular as it relates to the prevention and reduction of armed violence and armed conflict." These words refer directly to General

Assembly resolution 67/48 for whose creation and adoption Trinidad and Tobago has played a particularly leading role.

During the second ATT Diplomatic Conference in March this year, more than 100 states supported the inclusion of gender-specific provisions in the

treaty text. All of these states should take the opportunity during this year's First Committee to reaffirm their commitment to gender-sensitive arms control and disarmament.

Still, during last week's general debate, no references to gender or women's rights were to be found in for example the African Group's statement, nor in the statement by the European Union. This was despite the fact that the EU included a rather extensive section on the ATT, welcoming that the treaty "will prevent arms from reaching those who want instability and conflict, who commit atrocities and violate human rights and international humanitarian law." The EU should have seized this chance to reaffirm and mainstream its commitment to gender equality in the area of peace and security, by highlighting the ATT gender provisions. We noted that Ambassador Mariangela Zappia, Head of the EU Delegation to the UN in Geneva, pointed out when speaking at a seminar on the ATT in Rome on the very same day that "the Treaty is both modern and innovative in the way it recognises the specific potential impacts of international arms transfers on women and their rights." Ambassador Zappia further underlined that this is important not only in the context of the ATT itself, but also because it sets "a 'gender sensitive baseline' for all further multilateral work in this and other areas." The EU as well as other states should thus recognise this baseline in all multilateral work on disarmament on arms control, including at First Committee.

Entering the thematic debates of this year's First Committee, we expect more and stronger statements on how a gender-sensitive perspective in all policies and implementation efforts can be applied. 2013 has seen a pretty remarkable and growing gender equality and disarmament momentum. At the end of the 2013 First Committee, we want to see this momentum strengthened, not ignored. •

NUMBER OF WOMEN PRESENTING STATEMENTS DURING OPENING WEEK OF FIRST COMMITTEE: 8

TOTAL NUMBER OF STATEMENTS DURING OPENING WEEK OF FIRST COMMITTEE: 74

PERCENTAGE OF FEMALE SPEAKERS: 10.8

First Committee briefing book



Download or pick up your copy today!

DISARMAMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

Anna Eknor | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

A great deal of states emphasized the correlation between disarmament and development during the First Committee's opening week. The major points called to attention by states concerning this correlation included military spending and the arms trade.

The African Group, Bangladesh, Belarus, the Caribbean Community, Colombia, Egypt, Kazakhstan, Lao PDR, Nepal, and Tunisia, as well as most representatives who included issues of development in their statements, stressed that vast military expenditures should be redirected to social and economic development. Ambassador Khlari of Tunisia accentuated that funds used for nuclear weapons should "be earmarked for socio-economic development." A few states even reflected upon the immorality of spending vast amounts on military whilst cutting back on socioeconomic expenditures.

Russia was the only state that noted the expense of disarmament. Mr. Ulyanov, Director of the Department for Security Affairs and Disarmament of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, argued that nuclear disarmament is particularly expensive, stating that decommissioning one nuclear intercontinental ballistic missile costs up to US\$1 million. This was, however, countered by a great deal of states that brought attention to the vast sums of money spent on developing and modernizing nuclear arsenals, amounting to about US\$105 billion each year. Furthermore, Brazil's ambassador reflected upon the unfitness of nuclear weapons to address the root causes of lack of security: "From this perspective, nuclear disarmament is not only a rational economic measure, but would represent a much required correction of course with a view to addressing root causes of instability in the long run."

Qatar and Cuba stressed that even though cutbacks are made in public services all over the globe, military expenditure continues to increase. Bangladesh and Brazil stressed that the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) could be met by 2015 if half the annual amount spent on nuclear arsenals was redirected to achieving the MDGs. Achieving the MDGs would mean halving poverty for nearly five billion people. Nigeria stated that the "astronomical" cost of global military spending absorbs an unacceptable proportion of resources.

Colombia, Botswana, and Turkey singled out the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons (SALW) as having an especially devastating effect on development. Ambassador Ntwaagae of Botswana emphasized, "These weapons pose the gravest danger to peace

and security, not only in Africa, but the world at large. They also adversely impact on the socio-economic development process." Lesotho and Botswana further accentuated that it is developing states who take the brunt of trade in SALW and other conventional weapons. High Representative for Disarmament Affairs Angela Kane noted, "The costs of this illicit trade [in SALW] have included the prolongation of armed conflicts, the setting back of social and economic development, the aggravation of threats to peacekeepers, and regional instability."

Bangladesh, Colombia, and Lesotho, among others, expressed a hope that the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) will be effective in curbing the illicit arms trade flow, in particular regarding to trade in SALW, thereby having a positive impact on development. The programme for assistance for countries to implement the ATT was promoted by Estonia as beneficial for global development.

Ambassador Momen of Bangladesh stressed that the arms trade fuels violence and fans conflict. This further hinders development and often robs people of their right to actual security in the form of food, clean water, education, health care, etc. The Maldives Ambassador Sareer accentuated this, saying that "[e]very dollar we spend on nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction is a dollar that can be spent on overcoming poverty in our countries. It is a dollar that can be spent on educating a child, on eradicating non-communicable diseases, on hospitals, food, clean water, climate change adaptation, building resilience."

As First Committee moves forward with its actions this month, the Caribbean Community encouraged delegates to keep in mind that "success [in the areas of disarmament and non-proliferation] would strengthen international peace and security, free up vast and much-needed resources for social and economic development, advance the rule of law and remove a layer of fear that clouds all of human existence." •

SIDE EVENT REPORT: NUCLEAR SECURITY SUMMIT

Adam Wolf | NGO Committee on Disarmament, Peace and Security

This First Committee side event, hosted by the Permanent Mission of the Netherlands, focused on issues related to securing nuclear materials. As First Committee continues to discuss matters of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, the Belfer Center highlighted the potential risk that nuclear weapons pose when considering terrorists and non-state actors. Some governments and organizations are concerned with the threat of such actors acquiring nuclear and fissile materials persists.

Three key types of potential nuclear terrorism were outlined along with associated risks and implications. The first type is a nuclear explosion, in which a terrorist organization would acquire a nuclear bomb and detonate it in a target location. Such an event would be completely catastrophic and cause numerous casualties and disruptions within society. The second potential threat is nuclear sabotage, which entails disrupting nuclear facilities that enrich and use uranium. Constructing a “dirty bomb” out of radioactive material describes the third and final potential threat. Though casualties from such a device would be low, the cost of societal disruption would still remain high.

Evidence presented suggested that some groups, such as Al-Qaeda and Chechen separatists, have attempted to acquire materials to make a dirty bomb. Moreover, nuclear experts suggest that constructing a small bomb is still plausible given access to the adequate technical expertise and supplementary materials. The only needed component, which has proven difficult for terrorists to acquire, is highly enriched uranium. Though security measures have improved globally,

there is still some concern over the “security culture” of nuclear materials. Smuggling within Moldova and attacks on facilities in South Africa show that the quest for uranium by malicious organizations may still exist. Yet, the security climate surrounding facilities in the United States apparently remain too complacent, according to the speakers. Conducted security tests revealed that unauthorized personnel could still access nuclear facilities, even to the extent where a nun, Sister Megan Rice, was able to break through three security perimeters of a military grade nuclear facility in order to conduct a nonviolent protest against the US government’s continued possession of nuclear weapons.

Those concerned about these potential threats suggest that there could be room for renewed approaches towards nuclear security, both in the United States and globally. Being aware that the United States and Russia possess more than 90% of the world’s nuclear arsenal, the panel suggested that both countries establish joint cooperation by heads of state. Such cooperation would encompass coordination on potential nuclear terror crises and sharing of information and analysis on nuclear forensics.

Internationally, the panel discussion focused on non-nuclear weapons states and highlighted the importance of downgrading enriched uranium for non-weapon use. Further emphasis was placed on strengthening the International Agency of Atomic Energy and sharing best practices globally. Going forward, emphasizing the improvement of nuclear security globally was of high importance. •

SIDE EVENT REPORT: ESTABLISHMENT OF A ZONE FREE OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND ALL OTHER WMD IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Anna Eknor | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

This side event was organized by Egypt and chaired by the Egyptian Permanent Representative, Ambassador Mootaz Ahmadein Khalil. The event was intended to provide updates on the status of the conference and discuss potential ways forward.

Ambassador Khalil highlighted some of the positive aspects of the difficult task of making the Middle East a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other WMD, which include the global support for making this a reality and the destruction of chemical weapons in Syria. However, he also conveyed his government’s

disappointment that the conference on establishing this zone, which was to be held by the end of 2012, had been postponed.

To this end, he outlined his government’s initiative for making progress on this issue, which the foreign minister of Egypt also outlined during the General Assembly high-level debate on 28 September. The three points of the initiative are to invite all Middle Eastern countries and the permanent Security Council members to deposit official letters to the UN Secretary General stating their support for declaring the Middle East



a WMD free zone; for all countries of the Middle East to commit, before the end of this year, to simultaneously sign and ratify the relevant WMD conventions; and to pursue international efforts to ensure that the delayed conference is swiftly held, preferably before the end of this year, or in early 2014 at the latest.

Mikhail Ulyanov, Director of the Department for Security Affairs and Disarmament of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, noted that the Arab states have certain grounds for their criticism that the failure to hold the conference by the 2012 deadline was a violation of NPT commitments. He indicated that the conference's postponement was due to the fact that Israel was not yet prepared to attend.

UN High Representative for Disarmament Affairs Angela Kane underlined that the Syrian chemical weapons crisis is evidence that WMD are not a source of security, but rather are a threat to security. She noted that this situation could have been avoided if the Middle East was already a zone free of WMD. Ms. Kane indicated that consultations regarding the con-

ference on establishing this zone will be held in Glion, Switzerland from 21–22 October 2013.

Ambassador Shaker of the Egyptian Council for Foreign Affairs presented two papers dealing with specifics of what this zone would entail in practical terms, including what kind of verification system would be needed. The second paper outlined suggestions for a mock conference, indicating that a type of role play would be carried out with representatives of states in order to prepare for the conference.

During the Q&A period, a representative of Iran reaffirmed his government's intention to participate in the conference on establishing a WMD free zone in the Middle East. The representative of Finland indicated its continuing commitment to host the conference upon very short notice.

Ambassador Khalil concluded the event by stressing that the aim of all efforts on this issue must be to achieve a WMD and nuclear weapon free zone in the Middle East, not merely to convene a conference. •

CALENDAR OF EVENTS FOR THE WEEK OF 14–18 OCTOBER 2013

When	What	Where	Who
Monday, 14 October 13:15–14:30	Briefing to delegates on the UN Register of Conventional Arms and UN Report on Military Expenditures	Conference Room E North Lawn Building	UN Office for Disarmament Affairs
Wednesday, 16 October 13:15–14:30	The humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons	Conference Room A Conference Building	UNIDIR
Wednesday, 16 October 13:15–14:30	Strengthening non-proliferation: game-changing ideas	Conference Room 3 Conference Building	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland; British American Security Information Council (BASIC)
Wednesday, 16 October 13:15–14:30	Roundtable on transparency in military spending	Conference Room 7 North Lawn Building	UN Office for Disarmament Affairs
Wednesday, 16 October 19:00–21:00	Don't Bank on the Bomb	World Federalist-Global Policy Institute 708 Third Avenue (at 44th St), 24th Floor	Abolition 2000 NY Metro
Thursday, 17 October 13:15–14:30	Humanitarian initiative to prohibit nuclear weapons	Conference Room A Conference Building	Permanent Mission of Indonesia to the UN; Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs; Reaching Critical Will; Article 36
Thursday, 17 October 13:15–14:30	FMCT: the GGE and beyond	Conference Room 3 Conference Building	Permanent Missions of Canada and the Netherlands to the UN; UNIDIR
Friday, 18 October 13:15–14:30	Panel discussion on nuclear weapons and international law	Conference Room 7 North Lawn Building	Permanent Missions of New Zealand and Switzerland to the UN

SIDE EVENT REPORT: STEPS TOWARDS A MIDDLE EAST ZONE FREE OF WMD

Jacqueline Treboschi | NGO Committee on Disarmament, Peace and Security

Mr. Randy Rydell of the UN Office of Disarmament Affairs introduced the panel of notable speakers during this side event, which took place on 9 October. The discussion revolved around the panelists' informed ideas concerning the creation of a Weapons of Mass Destruction free zone in the Middle East (MEWMDFZ).

The first from the panel to offer his views was Ambassador Mohamed Shaker of the Egyptian Council for Foreign Affairs, who asserted that to progress towards the total elimination of nuclear, chemical, biological, and radiological weapons in the Middle East, all states who would be party to the MEWMDFZ must first become parties to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Chemical Weapons Convention, and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. Then, in order to promote greater trust, regional verification that the standards of these accords were being met would encourage more diplomatic interaction among Middle Eastern countries.

In regards to the issue of the postponement of the international conference to establish the MEWMDFZ, Dr. Shaker suggested that civil society might help alleviate tensions. Non-governmental organizations along

with top experts in the disarmament field could hold a mock conference, which he believed could model to Middle East states the type of success that the meeting could achieve.

The following speaker was Princeton University professor Dr. Frank von Hippel, who shared his insights on the MEWMDFZ issue and how to move forward. Dr. von Hippel argued that the use of highly enriched uranium and plutonium should be globally banned and that Israel's highly enriched uranium and plutonium stockpiles ought to be frozen. This would be overseen using a non-intrusive approach by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) as well as regional means of verification.

American Iranian Council Executive Director Emad Kiyaei offered his opinions and suggestions surrounding the establishment of the MEWMDFZ. He began by addressing the challenges currently being faced, such as the Israeli nuclear monopoly in the region, the Iranian nuclear programme, and non-universalization of WMD treaties. Mr. Kiyaei asserted that these obstacles could be reduced using solutions including greater transparency of Iran's nuclear programme to ensure that only peaceful energy purposes exist and the urging of Israel's cooperation from Western nations who share good relations with the country. Finally, he argued that if the benefits of the MEWMDFZ were made more clear to Middle East countries, negotiations might be more easily accomplished.

The final speaker was Mr. Hillel Schender, a prominent journalist, who gave an interesting point of view from Israeli civil society. Due to regime changes in Egypt and Iran and the recent diplomatic initiatives of Syria, he expressed optimism that Israeli relations with its neighbors may improve. However, he cautioned against pressing the country to sign the NPT and other WMD treaties initially. First, he argued, there must be an improvement of overall Israeli-Palestinian relations before moving forward with the MEWMDFZ.

The event indicated that the problems faced are not necessarily due to a lack of technical steps toward establishing the MEWMDFZ. In reality, there is a political unwillingness and deep-seeded mistrust between states in the Middle East that must be addressed. Until certain countries that view WMD as a source of power and security realize these weapons are truly the cause of insecurity, progressing toward a MEWMDFZ will continue to be an international struggle. •



SIDE EVENT REPORT: CYBER THREATS— INFORMATION AS A WEAPON?

John Burroughs | Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy

In a packed Conference Room A on 9 October, panelists at this UNIDIR-organized side event examined possible approaches to reduce the risks of disruptive or casualty-causing cyber attacks. A number of disruptive attacks are already known to have occurred (Estonia, Georgia, Stuxnet, Aramco, Republic of Korea).

In introducing the panel, Kerstin Vignard of UNIDIR highlighted a new UNIDIR publication, *The Cyber Index: International Security Trends and Realities*. It reports that as of August 2012, the number of national cybersecurity programmes is now 114, of which 47 give some role to the armed forces. Ms. Vignard spoke of a “rush to weaponize” and a consequent threat to geopolitical stability.

Sean Costigan of the Partnership for Peace Consortium of Defense Academics and Security Studies Institutes argued that too much attention is paid to the extremely challenging problem of attribution of attacks. He said that the focus needs to shift to state responsibility for ignoring or abetting attacks, or conducting them in association with non-state actors. He noted that some have proposed essentially redesigning the Internet to increase security against attacks, but believes this is unlikely due to “path-dependency,” i.e. technology choices already made.

Tim Maurer of the New America Foundation argued that whether a piece of code is a cyber weapon depends intrinsically on the vulnerability of computer and industrial control systems. In his view, a high priority for international collaboration is to “harden” systems to reduce vulnerability. In defining the con-

cept of a cyber weapon, Mr. Maurer distinguished between instruction in code that causes harm and data (content) that should be excluded from the concept. He said the problem must be disaggregated to make progress.

Karsten Geier of the German Federal Foreign Office observed that the problem of attribution makes classical military concepts of deterrence and denial difficult to apply. Germany emphasizes three areas for international cooperation: development of cyber resilience; confidence- and security-building measures, especially in regional settings, for example establishing channels for consultation; and development of a shared understanding of the application of international law in the cyber sphere.

Mr. Geier welcomed the step in this direction taken by the Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) consensus report released this summer (A/68/98). The report found that international law, in particular the UN Charter, is applicable and is essential to maintaining peace and stability and promoting an open and secure Internet. He emphasized that the applicability of international law means that Internet users enjoy freedom of speech and other human rights.

Mr. Geier noted that many issues remain to be resolved about the application of the UN Charter and the international law of armed conflict in the cyber sphere. To take just one example, when does a disruptive cyber operation qualify as an “armed attack” under the Charter, justifying the responsive use of force in self-defense? He recommended that the GGE be continued and tasked with examining such issues.

During the ensuing discussion, one question raised was whether it should be assumed that the cyber sphere is a legitimate arena for lawful warfare. Why not instead declare the cyber sphere demilitarized, as was done with the Antarctic and, so far as weapons of mass destruction are concerned, outer space and the ocean seabed? Another question was whether a GGE as those bodies are now structured is the best vehicle for examination of legal or technical issues. Why not a technical working group, or assignment of the task to a UN entity? •



SIDE EVENT REPORT: TWENTY YEARS OF RENUNCIATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS BY BELARUS, KAZAKHSTAN, AND UKRAINE

Mia Gandenberger | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

On Thursday, 10 October 2013, the Permanent Missions of Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine and Reaching Critical Will hosted an event to mark the 20th anniversary of the decision by the three states to renounce nuclear weapons.

Ms. Virginia Gamba, Director and Deputy High Representative for Disarmament Affairs at the UN, underlined the historic importance of the renunciation by Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine as “significant and praiseworthy”. The anniversary of this decision offered the opportunity to take stock of the role nuclear weapons play in national and international policies and question the relevance of nuclear deterrence. She went on to review recent developments in nuclear disarmament and among other things highlighted the re-emergence of the discussion on the humanitarian consequences of the use of nuclear weapons.

Mr. Aleksandr Mikhnevich, First Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of Belarus, explained that the decision by Belarus to renounce nuclear weapons was closely linked to its decision to join the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as a non-nuclear weapon state. He underlined that nuclear disarmament is possible, even in difficult times, as Belarus managed to disarm its nuclear weapons despite the serious economic strains resulting from the collapse of the Soviet Union. In closing, Mr. Mikhnevich expressed his disappointment that the nuclear renunciations process did not continue after the declaration by Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine.

Ambassador Barlybay Sadykov of Kazakhstan reminded participants of the many victims of nuclear testing on Kazakhstan’s territory. He, too, emphasized nuclear disarmament could be achieved even during times of economic hardship and underlined the negative effects of nuclear weapons on the sustainable development and socioeconomic development of a state. Ambassador Sadykov highlighted the crucial role non-governmental organizations had to play in convincing governments of the need for nuclear disarmament and stressed that complete nuclear disarmament is not a utopian goal, but an achievable one. Nuclear weapon free zones are an effective and realistic step towards that end.

Ambassador Yuriy Sergeyev of Ukraine explained that since the Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances, in which Russia, the United States, and the United Kingdom assured Ukraine against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, Ukraine decided to rely on international law instead of nuclear weapons. Additionally, baring in mind the risks of nuclear proliferation, Ukraine has switched from using highly enriched uranium to low enriched uranium, as the possession of nuclear expertise was a privilege, but came with a responsibility to the rest of the world.

Ms. Ray Acheson, Director of Reaching Critical Will, underlined that the decision by Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine “marked an official recognition that nuclear weapons are inhumane and unacceptable weapons and that no responsible state should de-



velop or possess them.” Ultimately, there is no other option to prevent the use of nuclear weapons, on purpose or by accident, than their total elimination. She reminded participants that nuclear weapons are the only weapons of mass destruction that are not yet banned and drew attention to the calls for the banning and elimination of these weapons during the high-level meeting on nuclear disarmament. Ms. Acheson urged delegates to First Committee to “take

up this call in their work here and beyond to make concrete progress on this urgent agenda.”

The remarks from the panel were followed by a brief question and answer session during which the representative of the Russian Federation congratulated the panelists on their respective countries’ decisions to renounce nuclear weapons. •



DON'T BANK ON THE BOMB!
featuring Susi Snyder of IKV Pax Christi
Wednesday, October 16th
7:00pm – 9:00pm
708 Third Ave. at 44th St., 2nd floor



IKV Pax Christi, a Dutch civil society organization that works with its partners for peace, reconciliation and justice worldwide, has just launched the 2013 Don't Bank on the Bomb report as part of the ICAN campaign for a treaty banning nuclear weapons.

Susi Snyder of IKV Pax Christi will be in NYC to speak about the new ICAN Campaign, Don't Bank on the Bomb. We hope to brainstorm and organize a Don't Bank on the Bomb campaign here in the United States.

PLEASE JOIN US AT THIS ABOLITION 2000 NY METRO MEETING AND BE SURE TO RSVP TO: aslater@rcn.com

FIRST COMMITTEE MONITOR

The *First Committee Monitor* is a collaborative NGO effort undertaken to make the work of the First Committee more transparent and accessible. The *Monitor* is compiled, edited, and coordinated by **Reaching Critical Will** of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF).

Contributing organizations and programmes to this edition:

Cluster Munition Coalition

Control Arms

Global Action to Prevent War

International Campaign to Ban Landmines

Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy

NGO Committee on Disarmament, Peace and Security

Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Swedish Section

www.reachingcriticalwill.org | info@reachingcriticalwill.org



Reaching Critical Will