



OEWG REPORT

*Civil society perspectives on the open-ended working
group on nuclear disarmament
2–13 May 2016*



Reaching Critical Will

**5 May 2016
Vol. 2, No. 10**

IN THIS ISSUE

- 1 | Editorial: 70 years of our discontent**
- 3 | Calendar of events**
- 4 | Norway's parliament wants a ban on nuclear weapons**
- 5 | News in brief**

The OEWG Report is published by Reaching Critical Will, the disarmament programme of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom

info@reachingcriticalwill.org
www.reachingcriticalwill.org

Editor: Ray Acheson

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

EDITORIAL: 70 YEARS OF OUR DISCONTENT

Ray Acheson | *Reaching Critical Will of WILPF*

Wrapping up the first week of the open-ended working group (OEWG) on nuclear disarmament with a focus on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons, Wednesday's OEWG meeting provided a chance for participants to articulate their concerns with the continued existence of these weapons and demand concrete action to eliminate them. Delegations highlighted the relationship of nuclear weapons to development, human rights, gender equality, and economic justice, making it clear once again that the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons is a key aspect of security for all. Lines are being drawn in the sand here in Geneva and the stage is set for next week's examination of elements for legal measures, provisions, and norms.

Leave no one behind

Displacement, mostly due to violent conflict, has reached record levels. The average length of displacement is now 17 years. 125 million people currently require humanitarian assistance. The funding required to meet these needs was up to \$19.5 billion last year. As Sara Sekkenes of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) said, "This is not sustainable."

It is not sustainable as it is now. But as both UNDP and the Austrian delegation emphasised, once you add a nuclear weapon detonation into the mix, things just get worse. The international system is overloaded as it is and the capacity to respond to the immediate and lasting effects of a nuclear weapon detonation is completely inadequate. "The overall scope of current humanitarian action and the costs to secure a sustainable and irreversible implementation of the 2030 Agenda [of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)] that leaves no one behind is already challenging the international establishment to the brink of its ability," explained Ms. Sekkenes. The likely impact of a nuclear weapon detonation "risks derailing multilateral commitments already made to humanity".

El Salvador echoed this concern, noting that the problem isn't just how much money is spent on nuclear weapons themselves, but how much money is diverted from the implementation of the 2030 Agenda. Brazil and Thailand highlighted SDG Goal 16, which is about promoting "peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development". While the only reference to weapons in the 2030 Agenda relates to reducing illicit arms flows, the effective implementation of Goal 16 and the overall agenda requires a human security integrated approach to weapons, war, peace, development, and economic justice.

The elimination of nuclear weapons should be mainstreamed throughout the international system, suggested El Salvador. The development, possession, proliferation, and use of nuclear weapons has implications for a range of issues and just as the UN system tries to "mainstream" gender and development across issue areas, it should mainstream disarmament. Sweden agreed that nuclear weapon issues need to be much better reflected and integrated in other policy points, including those related to gender equality and children's rights.

Leaving no one behind requires humanitarianism, inclusive and sustainable development, and the preservation and promotion of peace, people, and the planet, noted Ms. Sekkenes. "Such imperatives could help shift the discourse on nuclear weapons from strategic, security and military considerations to humanitarian, moral and ethical ones."

Humanitarian imperatives spur action

Another push towards the humanitarian, moral, and ethical considerations of nuclear weapons comes from survivors of nuclear weapon bombings and testing. Last month in Australia, four indigenous women from South Australia and the Marshall Islands toured four cities in four days to speak about the impacts of nuclear testing and call for a treaty banning nuclear weapons. On Wednesday in Geneva,

continued on next page

Editorial continued

Setusko Thurlow, survivor of the US atomic bombing of Hiroshima, addressed the OEWG. She talked about her experience in the bombing and called for the prohibition of nuclear weapons. Masako Wada, survivor of the US atomic bombing of Nagasaki, also spoke at the OEWG, calling for concrete action from the participating states.

Many states welcomed their testimony. “Her voice as witness and the weight of her moral authority cuts through all abstract debate to bring us a true understanding of the devastating reality of this terrible weapon,” said the Irish delegation. “We must never forget that when we speak of security, we speak of the security of humanity, of the men, women and children living in the nations we represent.” Austria’s working paper on “Nuclear weapons and security: a humanitarian perspective,” also makes this case, concluding that a national security approach does not contradict a humanitarian approach.

In this connection, Ireland urged states to take inspiration from survivor testimonies and to “channel our response to their powerful testimony into equally powerful action.”

Many states have chosen to do so. 127 have signed the Humanitarian Pledge to fill the legal gap for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons. These states submitted a proposal to the OEWG calling for the urgent pursuit a new treaty to prohibit and eliminate nuclear weapons. The Community of Latin American and Caribbean States has submitted a proposal calling for the start of “a multilateral diplomatic process for the negotiation of a legally binding instrument for the prohibition of nuclear weapons”. Nine states—Argentina, Brazil, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, and Zambia—submitted a proposal to convene a negotiating conference in 2017 for a legally-binding instrument to prohibit nuclear weapons.

Five Pacific island states—Fiji, Nauru, Palau, Samoa, and Tuvalu—submitted a proposal setting out possible elements to be included in a treaty banning nuclear weapons and calling for negotiations to begin later in 2016. Among the elements suggested in this working paper are obligations related to the fulfilment of victims’ rights and the remediation of contaminated environments. Palau, the first state in the world to adopt a constitution banning nuclear weapons, talked about the “untold anguish, heartache and pain” caused by nuclear testing and highlighted the importance of filling the legal gap for victims’ rights. The inclusion of victim and survivor rights in a ban treaty has also been suggested by ICAN members such as Article 36, Mines Action Canada, and WILPF.

Many delegations have indicated support in their interventions to the OEWG for the negotiation of a prohibition treaty, and many have done so before this meeting.

Narrowly-defined “national security” imperatives prevent action

Yet still a handful of states continue to insist on their “security dimensions” of nuclear weapons, as if national security is distinct from human security. At best, this suggests a disconnect between their sense of obligation to protect their citizens and their understanding of what is needed to do so. At worst, it is a demonstration of the state putting its own perceived interests ahead of its citizens’.

These states insist on an incremental, step-by-step approach to nuclear disarmament. On Wednesday, Australia, Belgium, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, and Norway once again spoke in favour of cautious steps that in effect prioritise the interests of the nuclear-armed states over the interests of humanity.

Japan highlighted the G7’s Hiroshima Declaration adopted last month. The commitments contained in this Declaration, as Wildfire has pointed out, are actually weaker than those agreed to by consensus at the 2010 NPT Review Conference. The 2010 outcome document unequivocally committed all states parties to the total elimination of nuclear weapons. The Hiroshima Declaration only commits the G7 states to “creating the conditions for a world without nuclear weapons”. “The commitment to seeking the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons appears to have been replaced by a commitment to seek the peace and security the G7 judge necessary for a world without nuclear weapons,” argues Wildfire. “One small change in text, one giant leap backwards for nuclear disarmament.”

Netherlands and Norway called for a focus on verification, transparency, and confidence-building measures. Italy demanded extensive and constructive engagement with the nuclear-armed states. These states have repeatedly spoken against the development of a treaty banning nuclear weapons. On Wednesday, Belgium again argued that it is “not the time” for such a treaty, suggesting it would lead to insecurity, mistrust, and less transparency—as if the nuclear-armed states’ or nuclear-supporting states’ engagement with each other or the rest of the world now is secure, trusting, or transparent.

Incrementalism versus bold action

Australia argued that the “progressive approach” advocated by nuclearised states is not designed to maintain the status quo. Yet, it has done so, for more 20 years.

continued on next page



Editorial continued

History shows that incrementalism is a code word for retrenchment. As Princeton University's Matt Karp has written, "The simple truth is that virtually every significant and lasting progressive achievement of the past hundred years was achieved not by patient, responsible gradualism, but through brief flurries of bold action."

This is as true with banning nuclear weapons as it is with national and local social movements spurring change around the world. Those in positions of power do not want to relinquish tools that they believe solidify their dominance over others. This power—and the tools that sustain it—must be challenged from the bottom up.

"We must be honest," said Dr. Ira Helfand of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) in his remarks. "Nations do not possess nuclear weapons merely to deter nuclear attack by other countries. They possess nuclear weapons to project national power. No nuclear weapons state has exploded an atom bomb on an enemy since Nagasaki, but they use them all the time to bully and intimidate the rest of the world. And in order to maintain that power they threaten the security of their own citizens and all of humanity."

The Thai delegation noted that there are prevailing efforts holding back progress on nuclear disarmament. It highlighted the importance of questioning the legitimacy of nuclear weapons and challenging the established narrative about these weapons of terror. Confronting and upending the narrative of those who hold humanity in contempt by wielding weapons of mass destruction is crucial to effecting change. This process is already well underway and the moment for prohibition is surging in Geneva and around the world. It is time for states to decide if they want to retrench the status quo or engage in a bold flurry of action to ban nuclear weapons for all.

In its remarks, Ireland quoted former foreign minister Frank Aiken from a 1963 speech to the UN, in which he argued that the non-nuclear-armed states can "do something more than watch and pray while the nuclear powers negotiate or fail to negotiate the agreements required to avert the dangers which threaten them and all of us." It is time to ban the bomb. Next week at the OEWG is an excellent opportunity to discuss how. •



The names of Setsuko Thurlow's 351 classmates, young girls who were incinerated by the atomic bomb dropped by the US on Hiroshima on 6 August 1945

Calendar of events

When	What	Where
10:00-13:00	Panel IV on essential elements that could form part of effective legal measures, legal provisions, and norms that will need to be concluded to attain and maintain world without nuclear weapons; exchange of views	Room XIX
15:00-18:00	Exchange of views on panel IV continued	Room XIX

NORWAY'S PARLIAMENT WANTS A BAN ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Grethe Østern | Norwegian People's Aid

The majority in Norway's Parliament reconfirmed on 26 April that they want an international ban on nuclear weapons and that they expect the government to contribute to achieve this goal. Norway's performance at the OEWG thus far is an indication of serious underrepresentation of the country's political and popular will.

Norway was instrumental in the start-up of the humanitarian initiative and hosted the first conference on the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons. Norway's current government, however, has been criticized by civil society and the opposition for abandoning the humanitarian initiative. After a period of heated debate, the Parliament on 26 April therefore adopted a resolution which contained the following majority amendment:

"The parliamentary majority supports the work with balanced and mutual nuclear disarmament within the framework of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, including a long-term goal of an international prohibition on nuclear weapons."

In a debate in Parliament about the resolution, Norway's former foreign minister and current prime minister candidate Jonas Gahr Støre drew parallels to Norway's contributions to the processes to prohibit antipersonnel mines and cluster munitions and said: "A total ban on nuclear weapons is a greater, more complex and probably more long-term task. Now the government has been given a clear march-

ing order for Norway's contribution to reach this goal."

Støre also said that "a real total ban on nuclear weapons" is "a goal that is fully possible to combine with the wording in NATO's strategic concept".

While the majority support for a prohibition on nuclear weapons is clear, the resolution adopted on 26 April also contains a consensus settlement which the parties in the minority government also supports. This settlement does not mention a prohibition explicitly, but says that Norway will work for "a legally binding framework" to secure the objective of a world free of nuclear weapons. It is difficult however, to envision a "legally binding framework" to secure a world free of nuclear weapons which does not comprise a prohibition on nuclear weapons.

If the Norwegian government wants to pursue a foreign policy which has support in Parliament, it must therefore support proposals tabled in the OEWG to commence negotiations on new instruments which can create the legally binding framework necessary for a world free of nuclear weapons, including a prohibition. Thus it is not only the value of the Norwegian Parliament's consensus settlement on nuclear weapons which is now being put to the test in the OEWG, so too is its government's respect for democratic principles. •



NEWS IN BRIEF

Mia Gandenberger | *Reaching Critical Will of WILPF*

The News in Brief is not a comprehensive summary of all statements. It highlights positions on a few critical issues covered during plenary discussions.

Panel III on additional measures to increase awareness and understanding of the complexity of and interrelationship between the wide range of humanitarian consequences that would result from any nuclear detonation

- Setsuko Thurlow, atomic bomb survivor from Hiroshima, shared her experience of the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons and called on states to work together to find a way to make disarmament a reality. She reflected that the most expedient way, according to the majority of states at the OEWG, is to ban nuclear weapons.
- Dr. Ira Helfand of IPPNW gave an overview of different studies on the impacts of nuclear weapon detonations conducted throughout the years and explained that recent studies have shown that even a very limited nuclear war will cause catastrophic damage on a global scale. He cautioned that the danger of nuclear war is not some theoretical possibility. Tensions in South Asia and between the US and Russia are significant and growing.
- I. Helfand drew attention to the working paper submitted jointly by IPPNW, the World Medical Association, the World Federation of Public Health Associations, and the International Council of Nurse, representing between them more than 15 million health professionals. The paper concludes that an evidence based understanding of the humanitarian consequences of nuclear war invalidates any conceivable argument for the continued possession of these weapons. It is time and past time to abolish these weapons and if the nuclear weapons states will not lead this process it is up to the rest of the world to do so.
- Sara Sekkenes of UNDP expanded on the potential consequences for, and interrelationship with, the wide range of other current humanitarian and development work by the broader UN system and member states.
- She stressed that the international community has in recent years been in a state of crisis management and the humanitarian and post-conflict development situation is already highly strained, and nuclear weapon detonation events would add hugely to the difficulty and complexity of response.
- Most speakers taking the floor warmly thanked Setsuko Thurlow for her testimony.
- Ireland recalled the statement of Kathleen Sullivan of Hibakusha Stories, who explained that nuclear weapons are very personal, threatening every thing and every person we love.
- Ireland stressed that survivor testimonies need to be remembered. As part of disarmament education efforts, Ireland paid particular importance to education about the gendered impact of ionizing radiation.
- Kazakhstan drew attention to the effects of nuclear testing at the Semipalatinsk test site and called for a more active and tangible movement towards the elimination of nuclear weapons.
- Kazakhstan highlighted the international day against nuclear testing and the WP on the CTBT, it had put forward with Japan.
- Mexico reiterated its full commitment to the achievement of a world free of nuclear weapons and recalled UNGA resolution 70/50 on the ethical imperatives.
- Mexico further shared the opinion of the James Marin Center as laid out in the WP.
- Mexico then asked the panelists how a nuclear detonation event would jeopardize the implementation of the SDGs and if it would impact progress already made on the MDGs.
- Mexico also highlighted its side event at the World Humanitarian Summit on 24 May.
- El Salvador stressed the possession or use of nuclear weapons cannot be defended and that as the humanitarian impact is most obvious on human rights and sustainable development, states should mainstream the prohibition of nuclear weapons across these policy points.
- In connection to the 2030 Agenda, El Salvador criticized the diversion of resources, not just money spent on nuclear weapons, from the universal development agenda. It asked how much of that could be used to implement the 2030 Agenda in a national context.
- Netherlands stressed that every aspect of nuclear disarmament is crucial and called for innovative solutions to complex problems.
- It argued that the relationship between trust and verification is a complicated one and some attention should also be paid to confidence building measures.
- Speaking for Hidankyo, Masako Wada, survivor of the Nagasaki attack, shared her personal experience and called on states to take concrete action.

continued on next page



News in brief, continued

- South Africa stressed that for too long the debate on nuclear weapons has focused on the security considerations of a handful of states, when the focus must be the security of all. Some are not more human than others.
- Ecuador stressed the importance of peace and disarmament education, in particular also for military and defense personnel.
- Japan highlighted the declaration of G7 representatives from their visit to Hiroshima in April 2016, in particular the final paragraph of the declaration.
- Japan stressed that states should be united in their disarmament efforts by the understanding of the humanitarian impact of a nuclear weapon detonation.
- In adding to points made by Ecuador regarding disarmament education, Japan highlighted its programme of youth communicators.
- Thailand stressed that without human security, national security cannot be achieved and sustained.
- Thailand further highlighted how the humanitarian initiative has been successful in raising public awareness of the catastrophic consequences of nuclear weapons, making the issue of nuclear disarmament appear more relevant to everyone.
- Thailand asked how this discussion relates to the context of the goal 16 of the SDGs.
- I. Helfand agreed with Kazakhstan on the grave legacy of testing, saying it was a shameful chapter in post WWII history and that it was also a worrisome indicator of the mindset of the people who developed these weapons and their disregard for basic human rights.
- He respectfully disagreed with the Netherlands's comment it is a long road to nuclear zero.
- I. Helfand agreed with the need to educate, rapidly, but as a tool to move a political process forward, not as an end in itself.
- Regarding new ideas, he stressed that the prohibition treaty proposed by many in the room was a way for non-nuclear-armed states to push nuclear-armed states to implement their commitments.
- S. Sekkenes recalled a field visit to the Semipalatinsk test site and explained that while working on a regional development strategy, the team had faced a number of challenges due to the long-lasting stigmatisation of the region.
- In responding to Mexico, she stressed that the work of international organisations will represent a fraction of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda; states' implementation efforts and resource allocation will make the difference for successful implementation.
- Building on the Irish intervention she stressed that nuclear disarmament is an issue of global governance and domestically budget allocations will have to follow that policy. SDGs are a universal agreement and therefore addresses inequalities within all states, including so-called developed states or nuclear-armed states. Since they are able to spend so much on the maintenance of their nuclear arsenals should not have problem to reach the development funding targets.
- I. Helfand recalled studies on the economic cost regarding a nuclear weapons explosion in a New York port that would result in costs of over a trillion dollars in terms of the international disruption of the global economy.
- S. Sekkenes reminded participants that the effects of a nuclear weapon explosion or exchange would be borne disproportionately by low income and other vulnerable states, as they may have a more limited capacity to respond to the arising challenges.
- She welcomed goal 16 of the SDGs as it has opened the door for peace and security discussions in the development framework. She called for this discussion to be brought into the global governance agenda. Some of the elements could be raised during the high level review in the summer of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.
- Nicaragua stressed that the suffering of the living witnesses of nuclear bombings here in the room cannot be unheard. The only effective prevention of this ever happening again is the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons. It therefore supports the recommendation regarding a legally binding prohibition.
- Nicaragua expressed support for the proposal to include educational measures in regional work i.e. that of OPANAL. It further welcomed the James Martin Center report as guide and model.
- ICAN stressed that precisely because of the catastrophic impact of nuclear weapons, anything less than a total ban is insufficient.
- Algeria highlighted the humanitarian aspects of the indirect consequences of a nuclear detonation on other international regimes in the areas of health, economic development, environment, and even disarmament. For example the imple-

continued on next page

News in brief, continued

- mentation of the Mine Ban Treaty or the Kyoto Protocol could be seriously hampered. Then, questions could be raised regarding the responsibility of the states involved in the detonation, namely those who control the nuclear weapons and those on whose territory the explosion occurred in relation to the implementation of these international instruments.
- Sweden supported all point in Annex IV of the Chair's paper. It further stressed the importance of disarmament education and in this connection highlighted the value of visits to Hiroshima and Nagasaki, but also the nuclear test sites.
 - Sweden said nuclear weapons issues need to be much better reflected and integrated in other policy points, i.e. regarding development and gender quality.
 - Brazil stressed the importance of connecting nuclear disarmament to other issues like at the WHS side event, and general peace, security, and development discussions, in particular in connection to goal 16 of SDGs.
 - IPPNW Holland suggested a ban treaty as part of a combination therapy for nuclear disarmament.
 - Palau stressed that every nation has a direct stake in realising a world without these indiscriminate, inhumane and immoral weapons. It was proud to be the first nation in the world to have adopted a constitution banning nuclear weapons.
 - Palau recalled that there is currently no international legal instrument to support the victims of nuclear weapons. It believes that a treaty banning nuclear weapons should contain obligations relating to the fulfillment of victims' rights and the remediation of contaminated environments.
 - Palau suggested that if an agency is to be established for the purpose of promoting the full implementation and universalization of the ban treaty, it should also have a mandate to educate the global public about the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of the use and testing of nuclear weapons.
 - In responding to a question by Nicaragua, S. Sekkens explained that while UNDP might have views regarding military vs. social expenditure of states, it is not part of their work to assess the costs for modernisation programmes.
 - She explained that everyone in the room might suffer from a professional disease regarding the siloed activities and called on states to practice as whole of government approach to address the cross-silo challenges these discussions pose.
 - I. Helfand recalled that the presentation of the medical evidence of the effects of nuclear weapons to political leaders has in the past had significant impact on their positions regarding these weapons. However, the access to leadership has changed over the years.
 - He further highlighted a forthcoming study on the effects in on a country-by-country case.
 - I. Helfand also drew an analogy between his drug-addicted patients and the nuclear-armed states, which show surprisingly similar behavioral patterns. The support of nuclear-allied states to them was therefore not an act of friendship, but as a perpetuating factor of this nuclear addiction.
 - Norway called for the continuation of the evidence-based approach to the humanitarian impact of any nuclear detonation and stressed the need for more knowledge and awareness.
 - Austria welcomed the clarification from panelists that the international system is already overloaded with problems and cannot afford to have the effects of a nuclear weapons explosion.
 - Austria said the increased awareness and understanding of the effects are at the heart of the humanitarian initiative. There is a need for an informed public. It asked what more could be done to further promote the understanding of the risks and consequences of nuclear weapons. It welcomed continuing the discussion of the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons in many global forums, e.g. the WHS.
 - Soka Gakkai International presented its working paper on nuclear weapons and human security, NGO.17.
 - Poland expressed support for the measures in annex IV of the synthesis paper and stressed the importance of disarmament education, including on the humanitarian consequences and in particular in states with nuclear weapons.
 - It asked how those aware of the consequences and yet willing to take the risk could be reached.
 - Australia argued that the progressive approach is consistent with the humanitarian approach and is not designed to maintain the status quo.
 - ICRC recalled the experience of the Japanese Red Cross societies in dealing with the consequences of the nuclear bombings. A 2009 ICRC study on the ability to provide effective assistance in the aftermath of a possible explosion concluded that this capacity does not exists in most countries. This has not changed.

continued on next page



News in brief, continued

- The ICRC also highlighted its 2013 four year plan of action to engage with the public on the national level, but it warned that raising awareness of humanitarian consequences is not an end in itself.
- Mexico recalled its previous analogy of nuclear-armed states and people who are addicted to tobacco, who will always find a reason not to stop smoking.
- Switzerland explained that the developments around the humanitarian dimension over the past few years have led many states, including Switzerland, to conclude that these weapons must never be used again, under any circumstances.
- Switzerland sees particular value in furthering studies on risks associated with nuclear weapons; furthering the understanding of the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons; and paying special attention to promoting disarmament and nonproliferation education.
- It thought it valuable that the OEWG reiterates the deep concern first expressed by the 2010 NPT Review Conference “at the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons” and “the need for all States at all times to comply with applicable international law, including international humanitarian law.”
- Belgium, as a country that experienced the devastating effects of two world wars, stressed that the awareness of the humanitarian consequences has underpinned its efforts to promote nuclear disarmament.
- It supports the progressive approach to nuclear disarmament and questioned the automatic link that has been made between the increased awareness of the humanitarian consequences and a treaty banning nuclear weapons. It argued there is no short cut to nuclear disarmament and a ban treaty now would not be good. It could even lead to insecurity, mistrust, and less willingness to share information, which would undermine transparency efforts also discussed in this forum.
- Italy stressed that the awareness of the humanitarian consequences has underpinned its efforts for effective progress on nuclear disarmament, which will be possible only through extensive and constructive engagement with nuclear-armed states.
- Sudan underlined that the consequences of any nuclear detonation would have impacts on neighbouring countries as well.
- Peace Boat explained that prohibiting nuclear weapons and thus establishing a universal legal norm against nuclear weapons would greatly help prevent the occurrence of the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons. It would accelerate nuclear disarmament, and strengthen non-proliferation and nuclear security. It would also promote confidence building and peace talks in regions with military tensions. If anyone argues that prohibiting nuclear weapons is bad for security, the responsibility of proof lies on that side.
- IPPNW stressed that all the governments at the OEWG can help cure the historical pathological denial by basing their policy and action on the evidence of what nuclear weapons actually do. The evidence demands urgent action to prohibit and eliminate nuclear weapons. This is a global health imperative.
- WILPF Scotland highlighted the inherent democratic deficit of nuclear weapons, gendered norms in arming and disarming, and climate change from Scotland’s unique perspective.
- The James Martin Center suggested states recall and endorse several key recommendations from the original UN Experts Group study.
- Wildfire drew states attention to the fact that the G7 Hiroshima statement discussed in the room actually represented a step back from previous commitments by this grouping.
- Honduras recalled the lessons learned of the past few years regarding the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons and underlined its readiness to ensure progress on nuclear disarmament.
- Mexico sought clarification regarding Japan’s statement for including a recommendation on the need of unity in the approaches to nuclear disarmament.
- Japan explained that the correct understanding of the humanitarian consequences should underpin all efforts and approaches towards nuclear disarmament.
- Mexico then specifically asked what Japan referred to in requesting not to divide efforts and in which way would the understanding divide states, as it is Mexico’s understanding that states are united in the understanding of the humanitarian consequences.
- Japan reiterated that the awareness of the consequences of a nuclear weapon detonation should be used to underpin all approaches and hoped for a consensus approach. •