

# FIRST COMMITTEE MONITOR

*NGO Reporting on the United Nations General Assembly  
First Committee on Disarmament and International Security  
4 October–1 November 2010*

**11 October 2010**

**First Edition**

**No.2**



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.

*Contributing organizations and projects to this edition:*

Global Action to Prevent War  
Global Security Institute  
International Action Network on Small Arms  
Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy  
Middle Powers Initiative  
NGO Committee on Disarmament, Peace and Security  
Reaching Critical Will of WILPF  
Religions for Peace



**[www.reachingcriticalwill.org](http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org) | [info@reachingcriticalwill.org](mailto:info@reachingcriticalwill.org)**

***IN THIS EDITION:***

Editorial: Overarmed and underfed . . . . .	3	Outer space . . . . .	13
Nuclear disarmament . . . . .	4	Conventional weapons. . . . .	14
International humanitarian law and nuclear weapons. . . . .	6	Arms trade treaty . . . . .	14
Negative security assurances . . . . .	7	Missiles and anti-missile systems . . . . .	15
Operational status of nuclear weapon systems . . . . .	7	Small arms and light weapons . . . . .	16
Nuclear weapon free zones . . . . .	8	Cluster munitions . . . . .	17
Nuclear testing . . . . .	9	Landmines . . . . .	17
Nuclear proliferation . . . . .	10	Disarmament machinery . . . . .	18
Fissile materials . . . . .	11	Regional disarmament and security . . . . .	19
Biological and chemical weapons . . . . .	12	Disarmament and development . . . . .	20
Nuclear energy and the fuel cycle . . . . .	12		

FIRST COMMITTEE MONITOR  
2010 Number 2 | October–November 2010

Reaching Critical Will | A project 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

PROJECT DIRECTOR/EDITOR: Ms. Ray Acheson  
PROJECT ASSOCIATE: Ms. Beatrice Fihn  
INTERNS: Emma Bjertén, Daniel Brunn, Jane  
Wolkowicz

COVER IMAGE: Unknown

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

**About Reaching Critical Will**

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.

On **www.reachingcriticalwill.org** you can find:

- All editions of the *First Committee Monitor*;
- All statements, working papers, resolutions, and voting results from all First Committee meetings since 2001;
- All statements and documents from the Conference on Disarmament, and regular reports on the plenary meetings;
- All statements, documents, and reports from NPT Review Conferences and Preparatory Committees, and archived editions of the *News in Review*;
- Research and analysis of critical issues related to disarmament and arms control; and
- News and information about civil society engagement for a nuclear weapon free world.



**Editorial: Overarmed and underfed**

Ray Acheson | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

The First Committee of the UN General Assembly is not dedicated to “Armament and International Security,” nor “Military Alliances and International Security,” nor “Nuclear Deterrence and International Security.” Its title in fact specifies that it is mandated to focus on *disarmament* and international security—linking in its very name the two concepts together. However, though most delegations to First Committee spent the opening week calling unequivocally for disarmament in order to achieve international security, the world is still overarmed while peace and development are under-funded, as UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon has stressed repeatedly.

“The General Assembly should not take a panglossian view” of the current situation, said Ambassador Soares of Brazil. Many delegations praised the growing momentum for multilateral disarmament, citing among things the adoption of a final document at the 2010 nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference and the commencement of the Arms Trade Treaty process, but several acknowledged that weapons—conventional and nuclear—are still seen as a source of security by those who possess them. The new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty between the United States and Russian Federation, argued Ambassador Soares, is “a bilateral instrument based on the idea of equivalence of arsenals and of mutual security. In other words, the treaty’s fundament is the persistent need of nuclear weapons to ensure security. The same reasoning is behind policies of other nuclear weapon States whose unilateral measures for arms limitation do not forsake what they call ‘a credible deterrent’.”

The vast majority of states have rejected the notion that nuclear weapons afford security and continue to advocate for their total elimination. “We see no justification for the acquisition or the indefinite possession of nuclear weapons and we do not subscribe to the view that nuclear weapons—or the quest to develop them—contribute to international peace and security,” explained the New Agenda Coalition. Norway’s deputy minister of foreign affairs likewise argued, “Nuclear weapons are a manifest threat to our common security, and they cannot be seen as a legitimate means of advancing national interests.” The Turkish and Jamaican delegations also noted that weapons of mass destruction do not provide security but that instead they undermine regional security and stability and breed a climate of fear and mistrust.

Other delegates noted the same is true of conventional weapons, remarking on the ever-increasing expenditure for weapons and military technology. Peru’s Ambassador Gutiérrez argued that conventional arms only serve to limit social development and maintain poverty and inequality, which feeds instability. Several delegations called for the resources spent on weapons and war to be redirected to meeting the Millennium Development

Goals and other development needs (see report on Disarmament and Development in this edition).

Some suggested that the most effective way to accomplish this is through a fundamental reframing of the concept of security. “We need to pursue a holistic approach which includes not only strict security policy and military considerations” but that is “based on a broader security concept,” said Ambassador Lauber of Switzerland. He argued that the international community “must take human security, environmental, development-related, and IHL-aspects into account if we want to make a real difference for the security of all people of the world.”

A few delegations made specific recommendations to this end, describing some of the elements that will be required to shift thinking about security. Honduran Ambassador Flores suggested that a strength of a nation does not have to be measured by the size of its military or its bombs, but that it should be measured by the wealth of its human heritage. Challenging the oft-repeated argument of the “deterrence” capacity of weapons, she also argued that deterrence is not necessarily having the greatest capacity to destroy but rather, it is no one having the capacity to destroy. Ambassador Lauber confirmed that his country will continue to “promote the debate on the credibility and usefulness of nuclear deterrence,” and “insist on the inherently inhumane nature of nuclear weapons” as a way to delegitimize these weapons and help prepare the ground for outlawing them.

Another important factor in changing conceptions of security will be to include a gender perspective in debates about security and disarmament. Norway’s deputy foreign minister highlighted the upcoming tenth anniversary of UN Security Council resolution 1325 on women, peace, and security and called for the inclusion of a “gender dimension in all disarmament efforts”. In 2006, the WMD Commission found that “armament policies and the use of armed force have often been influenced by misguided ideas about masculinity and strength” and that “an understanding of and emancipation from this traditional perspective might help to remove some of the hurdles on the road to disarmament and nonproliferation.” During the General Assembly debate in September, the prime minister of Trinidad and Tobago announced her country’s intention to introduce in First Committee a resolution on ‘women, disarmament, arms control and non proliferation’ as a way to link the advancement of peace and security with the advancement of women.

As First Committee engages in its thematic debates over the next two weeks, ideas for reshaping the concept of security will surely be forthcoming. However, as Tanzania’s Ambassador Sefue has already stated, “The right things have been said; now the right things have to be done.” •

## Nuclear disarmament

Jim Wurst | Middle Powers Initiative

The two major 2010 events in the field of nuclear disarmament—the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference and the new US/Russian Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START)—contextualized the opening debate in this year's First Committee. While welcomed across the board, many non-nuclear weapon states also said the progress represented in these and other initiatives need to be maintained and accelerated.

The UN High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Ambassador Sergio Duarte, framed his opening remarks with the optimistic theme of "momentum". He said, "There is clearly some new momentum with many of the issues before this Committee, including nuclear disarmament," citing New START, the Security Council summit on nuclear disarmament in 2009, the April 2010 Nuclear Security Summit in Washington, DC, as well as the NPT Review Conference. Noting that the Committee's discipline is diplomacy, not physics, he said, "We are less interested in motion itself than in the direction of our collective efforts, and in demonstrable results."

"Momentum" turned out to be a recurring theme: the European Union (EU), New Agenda Coalition (NAC), and others took the optimistic route, in contrast to last year's First Committee session where there was serious concern that the May 2010 NPT RevCon would face insurmountable obstacles.

Speaking on behalf of the NAC, Ms. Alison Kelly of Ireland said, "The leadership shown by key players and the outcome of the NPT Review Conference lend important momentum to our efforts to rid the world of nuclear weapons, but we all have a responsibility to ensure that this momentum is converted into real progress." Focusing on the NPT RevCon, she said the adoption of the final document with its action plan "includes the specific reaffirmation of the continued validity of the 13 practical steps of 2000 and of the unequivocal undertaking of the nuclear weapon states to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." The final document "is both a reflection of this interest and support, and a positive sign for the future of the NPT," Ms. Kelly said and called for implementation "without delay". NAC "underlines the urgency of speedy implementation of the actions" from the RevCon and said the Coalition "will monitor implementation of these undertakings, and offer our support for all activities in that direction."

Ambassador Jean Lint of Belgium said the EU "warmly welcomes the continued momentum in global arms control and disarmament and stresses the need for general disarmament." He called the NPT the "essential foundation for the pursuit of nuclear disarmament" and committed the EU "to implementing the action plan" contained in the final document. "This outcome has strengthened the international nuclear non-proliferation

regime by setting ambitious goals in all three pillars of the Treaty and by endorsing other concrete measures, including on the Middle East," he said.

The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) was more measured. Ambassador Hasan Kleib of Indonesia, speaking for NAM, noted "some positive developments," but said that "much more remains to be done to attain a world free from nuclear weapons." In particular, he urged the nuclear weapon states "to accelerate efforts to fulfill their obligations on nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects." He said NAM "emphasizes the necessity to start negotiations, as soon as possible, in the Conference on Disarmament on a phased program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons with a specified framework of time, including a Nuclear Weapons Convention." He reminded the Committee of the NAM position that elimination should be accomplished by 2025.

### *The nuclear weapon states*

The United States and Russia both lauded their strategic arms treaty—New START—calling it concrete proof of their commitment to nuclear disarmament.

US Assistant Secretary of State Rose Gottemoeller said her government "is committed to the negotiation of deeper nuclear arms reductions" and "will seek to include reductions in US and Russian non-strategic and non-deployed nuclear weapons in future discussions. Such reductions will introduce new challenges. Maintaining stability and verifiability of such reductions may require new approaches and new technologies. This is something that we hope to explore with other nuclear weapon states." She said with New START, Washington and Moscow "demonstrate that we are committed to full implementation of Article VI of the NPT. The New START Treaty will also set the stage for further progress in fulfilling the goals of the NPT and for expanding opportunities for enhancing strategic stability."

She also made it clear where Washington does not think progress can be made. "To build on the NPT consensus, the First Committee ideally will focus on issues on which there is international agreement, or on which national differences have narrowed," said Ms. Gottemoeller, "This calls for a pragmatic step-by-step approach rather than the impractical leap of seeking to negotiate a nuclear weapons convention or the pointless calls for convening a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, for which there is no international consensus."

Ambassador Anatoly I. Antonov of Russia said New START's "underlying principles of equality, parity, equal and indivisible security of the parties make it a new 'gold standard' for concluding disarmament and arms control agreements." He continued, "The narrowing numeric gap between stockpiles of our countries and the other P5

*continued on next page*



***Nuclear disarmament (cont.)***

members creates an urgent need for other states possessing nuclear weapons to gradually join the disarmament efforts,” he said. At the same time, he maintained the nuclear weapon states outside the NPT would have to join the process since “progress in disarmament will simply not be possible without the engagement of other states.”

Ambassador Antonov saw another major change coming in how reductions are framed. New START “has brought us to a point where considerable lowering of nuclear capabilities makes deeper reductions impossible without due regard to all other processes in the area of international security,” he said. Specifically, he cited missile defences, weaponization of space, and a “growing imbalance of forces in the area of conventional arms” as concerns that had to be addressed.

Ambassador Wang Qun of China said the RevCon “is of great significance to further enhancing the authority, effectiveness and universality of the Treaty.” While welcoming the new START agreement, he said the two parties should “continue to make drastic and substantive reductions in their nuclear arsenals, so as to create the necessary conditions for the ultimate realization of complete and thorough nuclear disarmament. When conditions are ripe, other nuclear weapon states should also join the multilateral negotiations.”

Ambassador Eric Danon of France said the RevCon “showed that for the first time, the international community was ready to deal with the nuclear issue in a comprehensive, global manner.” He noted his government has invited “our P5 partners” to a follow-up meeting in Paris next year.

India—one of the three nuclear weapon-possessors outside the NPT—framed its analysis in terms of the Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan. Ambassador Hamid Ali Rao said, “We believe that the progressive de-legitimization of nuclear weapons is essential to achieving the goals of their complete elimination. There is a need for a step-by-step process underwritten by a universal commitment and an agreed multilateral framework for achieving global and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament.”

***Non-nuclear weapon states’ initiatives***

While welcoming the outcome of the RevCon, Ambassador Jürg Lauber of Switzerland worried that “issues of utmost importance were watered down or even deleted from the final document.” He said if states were serious about zero, “a new approach is required towards a comprehensive legal instrument that can outlaw, once and for all, the most inhumane weapons ever invented. We were pleased that the Secretary-General’s five-point proposal gained traction. In particular, we were glad to see that many states voiced their support for starting deliberations on a nuclear weapons convention.”

Mr. Espen Barth Eide, the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of Norway also took a long view, saying, “If we actually want to move forward, we need to reframe the

question from one of whether a world free of nuclear weapons is feasible to one of how to actually achieve it, and how it can be undertaken in a secure, irreversible and verifiable manner.” There will be no disarmament without “rock-solid mechanisms for verification and a credible system for preventing that any party return to nuclear status.” The “overall objective” should therefore “be codified in a legally-binding instrument” with “both bilateral and multilateral verification arrangements,” he added.

Egypt welcomed the “positive developments” in disarmament. Ambassador Maged Abdelaziz said there was “no doubt” that the 2010 final document “represented an additional achievement in the field of nuclear disarmament this year,” despite the conference not accepting NAM demands for “marking the year 2025 as the appropriate timeframe for the realization of a nuclear weapons-free world through launching negotiations on a Nuclear Weapons Convention to totally ban nuclear weapons.”

Australia and Japan highlighted their joint effort to, as Ambassador Gary Quinlan of Australia said, “generate momentum by bringing together a number of countries” that would bring “fresh thinking and dedication” to put the decisions of the RevCon into effect. Ambassador Akio Suda of Japan said he hoped the new group of ten “will contribute to advancing concrete and practical measures towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons based upon an open and inclusive approach.” Ambassador Suda also said the annual Japanese resolution on nuclear disarmament—“Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons”—this year would be called “United actions towards...” in recognition that “the international community has gone beyond this stage” and should focus “on taking concrete and collective actions to reach such a goal.”

Ambassador Claus Wunderlich of Germany said his government had also joined this group and had invited the foreign ministers of the ten to meet again in Berlin. He went on to highlight two issues from the NPT Final Document: the commitment to “reduce and eliminate all types of nuclear weapons” and the commitment to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in military doctrine. “For the first time, we have a comprehensive approach which includes tactical nuclear weapons in any future disarmament process,” he said. The commitment to “reduce the role and significance of nuclear weapons recognizes the need to adapt security strategies and military doctrines and bring them in line with the objective of a nuclear weapon-free world.”

Libya proposed amending article VI of the NPT to include IAEA inspections of the nuclear weapons of the five states. “We call for extending the scope for the IAEA mandate to include verifying the reduction by the nuclear weapon states of their weapons; and inspecting their nuclear stockpile until the total and complete elimination of all nuclear weapons in the world is reached,” said Ambassador Abdurrahman M. Shalgham. •



## International humanitarian law and nuclear weapons

John Burroughs | Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy

The incompatibility of nuclear weapons with international humanitarian law (IHL) drew more attention this week than in past years, carrying forward the resurgent humanitarian critique of nuclear weapons articulated by the International Committee of the Red Cross and reflected in the innovative IHL provision in the 2010 NPT Review Conference final document. (See analysis in the Preview Edition of the First Committee Monitor.)

Two states referred directly to the final document in this connection. On behalf of Norway, Espen Barth Ede, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs, stated:

Weapons that cause unnecessary suffering and unacceptable harm have no place in today's international security environment.... The humanitarian dimension is of course as valid for nuclear weapons as for conventional weapons. This was a message from the NPT Review Conference in May, which expressed deep concern over the catastrophic humanitarian consequences that would result from the actual use of nuclear weapons. We also welcome the reaffirmation by the Review Conference of the need for all states at all times to comply with [IHL].

For Switzerland, Ambassador Jürg Lauber, Permanent Representative to the Conference on Disarmament, cited the IHL provision in the Final Document and declared: "Switzerland will continue to insist on the inherently in-

humane nature of nuclear weapons."

Other IHL-related observations came from Lichtenstein, the Rio Group, and Iran. Ambassador Christian Wenaweser, Lichtenstein's Permanent Representative to the UN, said, "we do not see how the use of nuclear weapons can be reconciled with [IHL]." Speaking for the Rio Group, Ambassador Octavio Errazuriz, Chile's Permanent Representative to the UN, stated: "The Group reaffirms that the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons constitutes a crime against humanity and a violation of international law and of the Charter of the United Nations." That position goes back to the seminal UN General Assembly resolution 1653 of 1961, "Declaration on the prohibition of the use of nuclear and thermo-nuclear weapons."

Eshagh Al Habib, Iran's Deputy Permanent Representative to the UN, told the First Committee that in an April 2010 message the "Iranian Supreme Leader" (Ayatollah Khomeini) "maintained that any use of or even threat to use nuclear weapons is a 'serious and material violation of indisputable rules of humanitarian law and a cogent example of a war crime. Accordingly, we regard the use of these weapons to be illegal and haram [religiously forbidden] and it is incumbent on all to protect humankind from this grave disaster.'" •

UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR DISARMAMENT RESEARCH

# UNIDIR

UNIDIR is pleased to invite you to the following seminars

### Space Security

#### *Next Steps for TCBMs*

(co-organized with Secure World Foundation)

Thursday, 14 October 2010, 13:15-14:30

Conference Room IV

### Improving the Effectiveness of the PoA

#### *Implementation Challenges and Opportunities*

Wednesday, 20 October 2010, 13:15-14:30

Conference Room IV

## IDEAS FOR PEACE AND SECURITY



## Negative security assurances

Jessica Erdman | Global Security Institute

In a manner consistent with previous First Committee debates, several delegations expressed their support for negative security assurances (NSAs). Many believe that assurances from nuclear weapon states that they will not use their nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapon states (NNWS) is not only a protection for the latter but that it can provide incentives for non-proliferation.

Delegations expressed overwhelming support for the establishment of legally-binding NSAs. Representatives from, among others, the Non-Aligned Movement, the African Group, the Rio Group, China, Democratic Republic of Congo, Uruguay, Venezuela, and Viet Nam echoed the overall necessity of creating such measures.

Chilean Ambassador Octavio Errazuriz pointed out that the only true guarantee of non-use of nuclear weapons is their total eradication. However, both the African and Rio Groups pointed out that “pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons,” NSAs are a next-best guarantee of non-use. Thus, they argued, while complete disarmament remains the primary objective, NSAs are a practical, immediate tool for the enhancement of international security.

NSAs are also seen as a catalyst for further progress on disarmament, and in particular, for the creation for nuclear weapon free zones (NWFZs). Kazakh Ambassador Byrganym Aitimova stated, “[A]t the same time, for the zone to advance multilateral disarmament, we look to the nuclear weapons states for providing the requisite negative security guarantees.” On a broader scale, United Arab Emirates’ Ambassador Ahmed Al-Jarman called for an internationally binding instrument on NSAs to bolster confidence among states.

The debate over what form binding NSAs should take or where they should be negotiated continued. Some delegations, including the Rio Group, Peru, the Philippines, and the Syrian Arab Republic, called for the Conference on Disarmament (CD), which has been deadlocked since 1998, to negotiate a legally-binding NSA treaty. Mr. Febrian Ruddyard of Indonesia called on states to negotiate an additional protocol to the NPT on NSAs. He argued that by doing so, states that have not yet signed onto the NPT will be offered a vital incentive to accede to the Treaty. Myanmar’s representative agreed with this motivation, pointing out that through NSAs, the nuclear non-proliferation regime would be “strengthened,” and that “delay in developing an international and legally binding instrument on security assurances for non-nuclear weapon states will not serve the interest of the NPT regime.”

Mexican Ambassador Claude Heller took a slightly different approach to the question of NSAs, reversing the causality of NSAs and non-first use. Ambassador Heller stated that non-first use agreements could lead to binding NSAs, and urged for further development of non-first use agreements. •

## Operational status of nuclear weapon systems

Sameer Kanak | NGO Committee on Disarmament, Peace and Security

During the first week of the 2010 First Committee, the issue of operational status of nuclear weapons merited cursory mention, as well as pledges of action to be taken later this month. Four states discussed operational status directly: Liechtenstein, Switzerland, New Zealand, and Chile.

Liechtenstein’s delegation began by stating its support for nuclear weapons convention as a “long-term goal [that] will not come about tomorrow.” As a result, Liechtenstein outlined a series of “small, practical measures” to achieve total nuclear disarmament, including reducing the alert status of nuclear weapon systems, or de-alerting. Liechtenstein stated that they support the New Zealand-led initiative in this regard. Switzerland’s delegation noted its strong commitment “to the step-by-step approach to complete nuclear disarmament and listed the “incremental step” of taking weapons off of high alert as a priority for Switzerland.

New Zealand’s delegation noted that it will serve as lead coordinator for the draft resolution on “Decreasing the Operational Readiness of Nuclear Weapons Systems,” and echoed the sentiments of multiple delegates who commended the United States for its de-prioritization of nuclear weapons within its national security strategy, as expressed in the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). The delegations of New Zealand and Chile both described the NPR as a positive, but ultimately small and incomplete, step towards disarmament.

The Chilean delegate’s speech echoed Liechtenstein and Switzerland’s arguments on de-alerting, outlining the need for total nuclear disarmament before recognizing the need for steps along the way, and finally emphasizing de-alerting as one of those steps. Chile also strongly supported the draft resolution on operational status, as well as New Zealand’s role in leading the de-alerting coalition. •



## Nuclear weapon free zones

Sean Kelly and Georgie Bright | NGO Committee on Disarmament, Peace and Security

During the opening week of general debate at First Committee, delegations gave considerable attention to the issue of nuclear weapon free zones (NWFZs). The debate focused on the importance of already established NWFZs, the prospect of their spread to new regions, and their general contribution to the global nuclear disarmament regime.

Sergio Duarte, UN High Representative of the Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, welcomed the recent entry into force of the Pelindaba Treaty and the Treaty of Semipalatinsk, which established NWFZs in Africa and Central Asia respectively. The Rio Group, Kuwait, and Algeria joined Mr. Duarte in acknowledging the importance of these treaties. The Chilean delegation and the Non-Aligned Movement cited the importance of the international community's recognition of Mongolia's status as a country free of nuclear weapons. Mongolia announced that it will be submitting once again a draft resolution to the First Committee entitled "Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status", and asked for the continued support of all countries.

The statement given on behalf of the Central Asian States asserted that the Treaty of Semipalatinsk has resulted in improved intra-region cooperation and stability in the region. Speaking independently, Turkmenistan's delegation advocated for the creation of a mechanism to oversee the Treaty's full implementation. With regards to the Pelindaba Treaty, Burkina Faso's delegation cited the Treaty's entry into force as contributing to the recent positive momentum behind nuclear disarmament. Additionally, the African Group called upon the nuclear weapon states that have not yet done so to ratify all relevant annexes to the Treaty to ensure its effectiveness. The Caribbean Community (CARICOM) and the Rio Group both acknowledged the importance of the Treaty of Tlateloco, which established a NWFZ in Latin America and the Caribbean, to building intra-region confidence and trust.

During the first week of debate, the most-discussed issue relating to NWFZs was the possibility of creating such a zone in the Middle East. The decision made during the May 2010 nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference for an international conference in 2012 to make progress on establishing a NWFZ in the Middle East has raised the profile of the proposed zone considerably. Tanzania, Ukraine, and Viet Nam were among a diverse group of delegations that voiced their support for the conference. China called for all parties to participate "in a constructive matter so as to ensure that the conference achieves a substantive outcome."

Within the region, however, considerably more blame was assigned to specific parties that have thus far prevented progress on this issue. Iran, Yemen, Lebanon,

Qatar, Iraq, and Syria all pointed to Israel's refusal to join the NPT as being the major impediment to the establishment of NWFZ in the Middle East. The concept of a Middle East free of nuclear weapons continues to be endorsed by Israel despite their acknowledgement of having "certain reservations regarding its language." Israel's delegation underscored the lack of trust in the region and, particularly, the nuclear programme of Iran and the rhetoric emanating from its leaders as the main factors preventing progress on this issue.

Outside of the Middle East, the Ukrainian and Bangladeshi delegations encouraged the establishment of a NWFZ in South Asia. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) expressed their hope that the nuclear weapon states (NWS) would accede to the relevant protocol attached to the Southeast Asia NWFZ Treaty to ensure its future viability. Mexico called upon the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) to abandon their nuclear programme in order to achieve a denuclearized Korean Peninsula.

Delegations also used their statements to acknowledge NWFZs as an indispensable part of the nuclear disarmament machinery. CARICOM cited the importance of establishing a NWFZ as an invaluable confidence-building measure. The Maldives highlighted the greater stability and prosperity that results from their establishment. The Central Asian States also noted the role NWFZs play in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons to terrorists or other non-state actors. Taking a broad view, the New Agenda Coalition asserted that "[t]he establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones enhances global and regional peace and security, strengthens nuclear non-proliferation and contributes towards the goal of nuclear disarmament." •



## Nuclear testing

Jane Wolkowicz | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

The International Day against Nuclear Tests was celebrated for the first time this year on 29 August. From Astana to New York, civil society and several governments rallied on this day for a global call to end nuclear testing in the name of worldwide disarmament.

Despite the support of a large number of states, as demonstrated by the statements given in the opening week of the First Committee meetings, many delegations believe that there will never be an end to nuclear testing until the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) has been signed and ratified with universal support.

During the opening week of First Committee, the European Union was firm in its support of the CTBT. On behalf of the EU, Ambassador Jean Lint of Belgium stated, "The comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban-Treaty is of crucial importance to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and a top priority for the EU. We are hopeful that renewed political commitments to pursue ratification, in particular within some Annex II states of the CTBT, like Indonesia and the USA, will give new impetus to our efforts to achieve the earliest possible entry into force of this key treaty."

Delegations who have already ratified the CTBT, including France, Japan, Switzerland, Kazakhstan, and the Russian Federation, also issued their support for the Treaty. As of this year, of the 183 States who support the CTBT, 29 have signed but have not ratified the treaty. Ambassador Anatoly I. Antonov of the Russian Federation urged, "all states, and first of all those on whom the CTBT's entry into force depends, to sign and ratify it as soon as possible."

Two of these states, India and Egypt, expressed continued hesitation and frustration regarding the CTBT in their First Committee statements. Egypt's Ambassador Maged Abdelaziz versed vexation with the ambiguous nuclear programme of Israel, making it clear that Egypt would not ratify the treaty without a change in Israeli policy with regard to nuclear weapons. Ambassador Abdelaziz explained, "Israel's persistence not to join the NPT as a Non-nuclear weapon state remains a significant obstacle facing the accession of Egypt to the two conventions and to its ratification of the CTBT, despite Egypt's support for the objectives and principles of the three instruments, since that would further widen the existing gap between the commitments of State Parties to the NPT which further implement all their treaty obligations."

Unlike Egypt, which supports the "objectives and principles" behind the CTBT, India's Ambassador Halid Ali Rao only reiterated his country's voluntary moratorium on nuclear explosive testing. When it comes to nuclear testing, however, delegations including the United Arab Emirates and Nigeria do not believe a voluntary

moratorium or nuclear deterrents are enough. "Nuclear Weapons States should continue to maintain the existing moratorium on nuclear-weapon test explosions or explosions of any other nuclear device," said Ambassador Joy U. Ogwu of the Nigerian delegation, who continued, "The above notwithstanding, Nigeria believes that a moratorium is not, and cannot be a substitute for a treaty. CTBT is the ultimate goal."

Several delegations also echoed the conviction of UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, who, at the 23 September ministerial meeting in support of the CTBT, underscored that "developing new nuclear weapons and modernizing existing weapons are incompatible with our collective non-proliferation and disarmament efforts." At First Committee, the delegations of Colombia, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Lesotho likewise highlighted the role of the CTBT in curbing the modernization of nuclear weapons. Ambassador Claudia Blum de Barberi of Colombia "stressed the existing incompatibility between the development of new, more powerful and more destructive nuclear weapons, with respect to the letter and spirit of the Treaty." She reiterated, "The international community must be aware of this risk. It is therefore essential to ensure the full compliance with all provisions of the Treaty as well as the cooperation among States in combating this threat."

In positive news, the government of Indonesia last week submitted a draft law for ratification of the CTBT. Indonesia's delegation also announced that their delegation would consider being a co-sponsor of a First Committee resolution on the CTBT tabled by Australia, New Zealand, and Mexico. •



## Nuclear proliferation

Ray Acheson | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

During the opening week of First Committee, most delegations highlighted the link between nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Among others, Kuwait's Ambassador Almutairi pointed out that nuclear weapons do not bring security to any country, only proliferation, and the New Agenda Coalition and the Rio Group argued that nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation are intrinsically linked and mutually reinforcing processes that require continuous and irreversible progress.

While Ambassador Danon of France proclaimed that nuclear proliferation is the "greatest danger facing our planet today," the overwhelming majority of delegations agreed that it not merely the proliferation, but the existence of nuclear weapons that threatens the survival of the planet. The Central Asian countries party to the Semipalatinsk nuclear weapon free zone treaty suggested that if the nuclear weapon states want to prevent proliferation, they must renounce and reduce their arsenals.

### *Vertical proliferation*

Many countries criticized the nuclear weapon states for their plans to modernize or refurbish their nuclear weapons, including those in ASEAN and the Rio Group. "Unilateral reductions are welcome but insufficient, especially when they occur in tandem with the modernization of nuclear arsenals," said Brazil's minister for external relations at the UN General Assembly general debate in September. Several delegations echoed this sentiment in First Committee, while others—including Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, and Lesotho—arguing that such modernization violates the spirit and letter of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty's stated goal of "constraining the development and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and curbing the development of advanced new types of weapons, as well as preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects."

### *Enhancing the non-proliferation regime*

Several delegations issued support for existing measures to prevent nuclear proliferation. While most of these called for full implementation of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) comprehensive safeguards agreements, Chile, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Russia, and Turkey also called for the universalization of the IAEA additional protocol. Libya's delegation suggested that IAEA safeguards should apply to nuclear weapon states and that the Agency's mandate should include verifying the reduction of nuclear weapons. Delegates from Qatar and Syria pointed out that preventing proliferation requires states to cease from making decisions to grant exceptions on nuclear trade with states that are not party to the NPT.

A few delegations focused on preventing non-state actors from acquiring nuclear materials, issuing various levels of support for UN Security Council resolution

1540 and other related tools. The Republic of Korea mentioned it would hold a nuclear security summit in 2012 "to explore new and creative ways to further enhance nuclear security," while Chile, Mexico, and Ukraine announced in a joint statement that they have eliminated highly enriched uranium for civilian purposes as a contribution to nuclear security. Malaysia's Ambassador Ali said that his government has implemented a Strategic Trade Act to control the export, trans-shipment, transit, and brokering of WMD-related arms, materials, and technologies. Nigeria's ambassador, however, reminded the Committee that nuclear disarmament "represents the most effective way of ensuring" that nuclear weapons do not fall into the hands of non-state actors.

### *Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK)*

A few delegations focused on country-specific proliferation concerns. The European Union, Australia, France, Japan, and the Republic of Korea expressed their concern over the DPRK's nuclear activities. These countries, along with the New Agenda Coalition and Turkey, urged the DPRK to fulfill its commitments under the 2005 joint statement to abandon its nuclear weapons and return to the NPT and IAEA safeguards. Turkey's delegation called on the DPRK to return to the Six Party Talks immediately and without condition, though the Republic of Korea's delegate made it clear that his country expects the DPRK to first "demonstrate its sincerity toward denuclearization by taking concrete actions" before talks can resume. The DPRK delegation itself reiterated that as long as the US "pursues the hostile policy and escalates nuclear threats against the sovereignty and existence of our nation, the DPRK will continue to increase its self-defensive deterrence."

### *Iran*

The European Union, Australia, France, Japan, and the Republic of Korea also expressed concern about Iran's nuclear programme. They highlighted UN Security Council resolutions on the issue and called on Iran to cooperate with the IAEA. Mexico's Ambassador Heller suggested that if Iran's purpose is peaceful then achieving its goals in a fully transparent manner with IAEA approval should not be an obstacle but a priority to end skepticism of the international community. The delegations of Bahrain and Kuwait also called for transparency by Iran while confirming the right of Iran to develop nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

Several delegations emphasized the importance of dialogue. China's Ambassador Wang hoped for the resumption of E3+3 talks, while Iran's Ambassador Habib noted that the Tehran Declaration jointly signed with Turkey and Brazil "is a positive step forward which provides an appropriate ground to move in a right direction." Turkey's Ambassador Apakan said his country will

*continued on next page*



## Fissile materials

Daniel Brunn | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

One item on several delegations' agendas at First Committee is moving forward on negotiations of a treaty banning the production of fissile materials for weapons purposes. Talks in the 2010 Conference on Disarmament (CD), however, failed for the twelfth consecutive year to produce an agreement to launch negotiations for such a treaty, leaving virtually all delegations with a sense of frustration and disappointment. Speaking for the United States, Rose E. Gottemoeller asserted that the delay in commencing negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT) was "unwarranted and out of step with the expectations of the wide majority of states seated here today."

Highlighting the importance of a fissile materials treaty, Kazakhstan's Ambassador Byrganym Aitimova stated that such a treaty "is a pressing item on two fronts: to keep the possibility of illegitimate military nuclear programmes to the minimum, and strengthen control over existing materials, thereby greatly reducing the risk of nuclear terrorism—one of the greatest threats besetting humankind today." Belgium's Ambassador Jean Lint, speaking on behalf of the European Union, added that an FMCT "would significantly strengthen nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and contribute to a climate of mutual trust and security."

Nonetheless, differences regarding what the scope of a potential fissile materials treaty should be came up repeatedly. The delegations of Myanmar, Indonesia, Colombia, and Ukraine each called for a treaty which would not only aim to ban all future production of weapons-grade material, but would also mandate nuclear weapon states to downsize their existing stockpiles so as to "ensure that such materials will not be utilised or diverted for producing nuclear weapons," as Mr. Febrian Ruddyard from Indonesia asserted in his statement.

The government of Pakistan, a vocal advocate for this position and the country often blamed for the paralysis in the CD for the last two years because of its opposition to the latest series of proposed programmes of work, has not yet addressed the First Committee. However, a few delegations addressed Pakistan's position during the opening week. For example, New Zealand Ambassador Dell Higgle stated: "We respect and understand the right of members to protect their vital security interests. What we do not understand is why those interests cannot be taken into account in the negotiating process rather than used as a veto even to begin negotiations."

Despite the stalemate in the CD because of the difficulty of reaching the required consensus of all 65 of its members, many delegations, including those from France, China, and Turkey, declared during the general debate their unwavering commitment to keeping talks for a fissile materials treaty within this body. Amba-

sador Wang Qun affirmed that China "firmly believe[s] that, for [the completion of] a 'Fissile Materials Cut-off Treaty' ... with the participation of all states concerned, [the] CD is the only viable forum."

Several other delegations, nevertheless, announced that they would support moving negotiations for a fissile materials treaty to another forum if the current deadlock in the CD continued. Among these were the United States, Japan, Liechtenstein, and Australia, with the Australian ambassador warning, "the CD does not have a monopoly on ... negotiations and ... other treaties have been successfully negotiated outside the CD.... If the CD cannot return to work and sustain that work, we will need to consider other avenues for the FMCT."

Various states also announced their intention to put forward resolutions touching upon the issue of a fissile materials treaty, including India, France, and Canada, the last of which will serve as the next president of the CD at the beginning of its 2011 session. •

### Nuclear proliferation (cont.)

continue to supporting and facilitating the diplomatic process on this issue. Venezuela's delegation expressed concern with "maneuvers and pressure from the United States and other Western nations" and called on the UN to "intensify its diplomatic efforts to facilitate dialogue and negotiation between the IAEA ... and the Government of Iran, to overcome this impasse in the restoration of confidence."

#### *Israel*

Several delegations, including most from the Middle East, called on Israel to accede to the NPT and to place its nuclear facilities under IAEA safeguards. Ambassador Maged Abdelaziz of Egypt called on Israel to realize that the decision of the 2010 NPT Review Conference to convene a conference in 2012 on establishing a nuclear weapon free zone in the Middle East actually achieves Israel's security interests by laying "the foundations for Israel to abandon its ambiguous nuclear program and assure us all that no other State in the regional shall seek to acquire nuclear weapons in the future."

Israel's delegation criticized the annual resolution on proliferation in the Middle East, arguing that it constitutes a declaration by its sponsors that they prefer to continue to try and alienate Israel. Egypt's delegation responded in a right of reply to clarify that the resolution is not a declaration but an invitation that has been on the table for many years and continues to be ignored. The Egyptian delegation also said they would reconsider tabling this resolution if Israel reconsidered the 2012 conference. •

## Biological and chemical weapons

Emma Bjertén | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

In the opening week of the general debate, many called for a complete elimination of weapons of mass destruction. While most of the states stressed the importance of elimination of nuclear weapons, a few states addressed either chemical or biological weapons.

Most of these declared their support for the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC). The CWC opened for signature in 1993 and entered into force in April 1997. More than 180 countries have signed the CWC, including the United States, Russia, and China. The treaty bans the “development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons” while earlier agreements only banned the use. The BTWC was signed in 1975. Over 170 states are today part of the Treaty, which bans the development, production, stockpiling, or acquisition of biological agents or toxins of any type or quantity that do not have protective, medical, or other peaceful purposes, or any weapons or means of delivery for such agents or toxins.

Compared to the CWC, which has the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) to implement the treaty, the BTWC has no verification provisions. Brazil’s Ambassador Soares expressed his concern with this, saying the relative success of the CWC “shows the advantages of well negotiated and precise text. These qualities are not found in the Convention banning biological weapons. It remains uncertain if the BTWC would pass the test of an actual attack.” Ambassador Soares said the upcoming Review Conference on the BTWC will face many uncertainties over the implementation of the Convention.

The United States, India, Malaysia, the European Union, and China stressed the great importance of the 7th Review Conference of BTWC, which will be held next year in Geneva. The European Union, represented by Ambassador Jean Lint of Belgium, described the upcoming conference as a “key opportunity to further strengthen the BTWC and its implementation.” Ambassador Wang Qun of China announced that China, together with Canada and the Implementation Support Unit (ISU) of the BTWC, will co-host an international workshop on the Review Conference in Beijing this November. China hoped the workshop would contribute to the success of the upcoming Review Conference.

Discussion of chemical and biological weapons concentrated around the challenges of the full implementation of the two treaties, specially regarding stockpile destruction. The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), Brazil, South Africa, and Mexico expressed their concern that the two major possessor powers have indicated that they will not meet the final destruction deadline of the CWC, which is 28 April 2012. Rose E. Gottemoeller of the United

States said the United States is pleased to report that 90 percent of their stockpile of chemical weapons is on pace to be verifiably destroyed by April 2012. “Our Government currently is examining all options to accelerate the destruction of 10 percent of our stockpile in a manner that is safe and environmentally sound. This work is difficult dangerous, and much more technically complex and time-consuming than previously envisioned, but we are committed to complete destruction,” declared the United States. The NAM, represented by Ambassador Hasan Kleib of Indonesia, “strongly urged the Possessor States Parties to take all necessary measures to accelerate their destruction operations.” •

## Nuclear energy and the fuel cycle

Lauren Patti and Tabitha Carlson | NGO Committee on Disarmament, Peace and Security

Outside of First Committee, debate has continued about whether developing multilateral approaches to the fuel cycle, such as establishing an international fuel bank as proposed by Russia, would regulate access to nuclear technology and thus prevent nuclear weapon proliferation or whether it would undermine the right of states to develop their own indigenous energy capacities. Russia confirmed this week that it will continue to pursue initiatives to establish international centres for the purpose of supplying nuclear technology. It appears that such initiatives will gain support from some, including the European Union, which reaffirmed its support for a multilateral approach to the nuclear fuel cycle.

Nigeria, Iran, Kenya, China, Chile, Senegal, and others asserted that all states party to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty have the right to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. South Africa’s delegation argued that restricting access to the nuclear fuel cycle impedes states’ rights to pursue the technology. It asserted that such pursuits should remain “sovereign” decisions based on domestic needs. While it recognized the proliferation implications associated with the transfer of nuclear technology, South Africa’s ambassador maintained that these concerns should not lead to “unwarranted restrictions and controls over the legitimate peaceful use of nuclear energy.”

In a joint statement, Chile, Mexico, and Ukraine declared that they have eradicated “the use of highly enriched uranium (HEU) for civilian purposes.” They cautioned that the existence of such material increases the likelihood of its acquisition by non-state actors, thereby escalating the threat of nuclear terrorism. •



## Outer space

Beatrice Fihn | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

During the general debate, several delegations highlighted outer space as an area of priority for their governments and many speakers called upon the Conference on Disarmament (CD) to resume work on this topic. As in previous years, delegations mentioned two different approaches to enhancing space security: legally-binding instruments and voluntary transparency and confidence-building measures (TCBMs).

The most notable development during the first week was the Russian announcement that their annual resolution on the development of TCBMs in outer space would this time include a call for the convening of a Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) "to examine, summarize and develop measures proposed by various UN member states, as well as to prepare an expert report and recommendations on the implementation of such measures." AGGE could assist governments in clarifying complex concepts and definitions needed to enhance space security and facilitate further cooperation in this area. As Ambassador Antonov stated, "TCBM's in outer space activities is a prerequisite to ensuring stability and security".

Despite the decision to move TCBMs forward through the establishment of a GGE, the Russian delegation still emphasized that preventing the placement of any kind of weapons in outer space remains a priority. Ambassador Antonov highlighted that Russia is looking forward to the intensification of collective work on the draft Prevention of Placement of Weapons in Outer Space Treaty (PPWT) submitted by Russia and China to the CD in 2008,

and invited all states to become involved in that work.

China, the Rio Group, India, and Brazil agreed on the need for a legal instrument on prevention of weaponization in outer space. The Brazilian delegation argued that such an instrument should be "aimed at forbidding the placement of weapons in outer space; the destruction or damage of satellites from ground-based platforms; or the use of orbital objects to damage or destroy satellites." Both India and China agreed that while useful, TCBMs could only be considered complimentary to a legally-binding agreement. Ambassador Qun from China argued that while "it's true that certain appropriate and feasible TCB measures in outer space may help safeguard outer space security, they nevertheless cannot substitute the role of the afore-mentioned legal instrument. They may only supplement such a role."

Recognizing that the current situation requires enhanced international space cooperation, the European Union argued that "while further multilateral legally binding commitments have been proposed, pragmatic and voluntary confidence-building and transparency measures would allow relatively rapid subscription by as many countries as possible and could bring effective security benefits in the short term". The EU highlighted its draft Code of Conduct for Outer Space activities as such an example.

The Egyptian delegation announced that it would table the annual resolution "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", which contains no substantive changes

*continued on page 16*

SECURE WORLD FOUNDATION AND THE UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR DISARMAMENT RESEARCH

## SPACE SECURITY: NEXT STEPS IN TCBMs

Thursday, 14 October 2010, 13:15– 14:30, Conference Room 4

### SPEAKERS

#### THE U.S. NATIONAL SPACE POLICY, INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND THE PURSUIT OF TCBMs

##### FRANK ROSE

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Defense Policy and Verification Operations, Department of State, United States of America

#### THE RUSSIAN APPROACH TO TCBMs FOR SPACE

##### VICTOR VASILIEV

Deputy Permanent Representative to the CD, Russian Federation

#### THE EU PROPOSAL FOR AN INTERNATIONAL CODE OF CONDUCT FOR SPACE ACTIVITIES AS A TCBM

##### JEAN-FRANÇOIS MAYENCE

Head of the Legal Unit "International Relations," Federal Office for Science Policy, Belgium

### MODERATORS

THERESA HITCHENS, UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR DISARMAMENT RESEARCH  
BEN BASELEY-WALKER, SECURE WORLD FOUNDATION

A light sandwich lunch will be served in the West Delegates' Lounge (North Lawn Conference Building, ground floor, off main concourse) at 13:00. If further information is required, please contact Tiffany Chow at [tchow@swfound.org](mailto:tchow@swfound.org).



## Conventional weapons

### Global Action to Prevent War

During First Committee general debate, non-nuclear issues are not discussed nearly as frequently as nuclear ones, and are often discussed in vague, non-policy-specific ways. In the case of conventional weapons, few delegations mentioned them explicitly and those that did focused primarily on issues of small arms and light weapons, appropriate enough given what most states and civil society representatives consider to be a successful Fourth Biennial Meeting of States (BMS4) occurred this July. Most delegations made reference to non-nuclear weapons in the end sections of their presentations; even then, direct references to ‘conventional weapons’ as such were scarce. There was little mention at all of the conventional weapons chronicled in the UN’s voluntary Register of Conventional Arms, with the exception of missiles (see report on Missiles and anti-missile systems).

Much of the general discussion during First Committee, of course, had ramifications for conventional weapon issues as well as nuclear ones. Mexico’s ambassador reminded delegations seemingly preoccupied with nuclear questions that the discussions of the First Committee are not all about weapons of mass destruction, and that the irresponsible or illicit use of conventional weapons is underpinning many conflicts that jeopardize peace and security and have a negative impact on civilian populations. Honduras’ ambassador picked up the theme, noting that combating the illicit trafficking in arms is important to their region because these countries aren’t merely protagonists of an unbridled arms race but primarily victims of such as race. Kenya, Cuba, and others made mention of the degree to which conventional weapons—specifically small arms and light weapons—are their “weapons of mass destruction.”

Conventional weapons were raised specifically in terms of the control of their trade and proliferation. Ambassador Hasan Kleib of Indonesia, speaking on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, encouraged states to become parties to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW) and its protocols, which focus on weapons deemed particularly injurious or having indiscriminate effects. The CCW is specifically concerned with “remnants of war,” booby traps, mines, and related weapons. The ambassador of Saudi Arabia noted (in a manner that would likely find acceptance among many delegations) that regional peace is predicated on the control of conventional weapons, especially illicit weapons. Ambassador A. K. Abdul Momen of Bangladesh made an even stronger statement that linked nuclear and conventional disarmament, urging delegates not to “lose sight” of the conventional weapons issue, specifically the impact of these weapons on fulfillment of the Millennium Development Goals. •

## Arms trade treaty

### Global Action to Prevent War

A number of delegations made direct reference to the need for continued support of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) process. While their remarks were largely summaries of and closely resembled positions shared during the ATT Preparatory Committee in July, there were some interesting nuances from specific delegations, many of which are already looking towards the next stage of the process, to be held in February 2011.

Some delegate comments had general applicability to a variety of inter-related disarmament activities, including the ATT. The New Agenda Coalition, picked up the theme laid out by High Representative Duarte and called for the momentum from the summer’s disarmament events to be converted into real progress in the fall. Uganda’s delegation called for more national efforts to supplement regional and international efforts on illicit weapons, though the ATT was not mentioned *per se*.

Some delegate comments laid out specific criteria for an ATT. Ambassador Joy U. Ogwu of Nigeria, representing the African Group, called for an ATT that should be “universal, balanced, fair and resistant to political abuse”. Ethiopia’s delegation supported the African Group statement and issued its own call for an ATT embracing the “highest possible standards,” including human rights provisions. Kenya noted the increasing “black market” in weapons and urged delegates to address the illicit trade in weapons by looking closely at export controls, loopholes in national laws, and the seemingly insatiable appetite for these weapons in many communities and nations worldwide. Senegal’s ambassador went even further, calling for ATT that integrates all conventional weapons including SALW as well as ordinance. Senegal is seeking clearly defined criteria including coverage of weapons brokering, full respect for international humanitarian law and human rights obligations, and commitments to institutional capacity-building and international cooperation and assistance. Morocco also seeks an ATT negotiated on founding principles of international law, but in that context specifically cited territorial integrity, sovereignty, and principles of legitimate defence.

The territorial integrity theme was echoed in a statement by Minister Febrian Ruddyard of Indonesia, who also pledged to uphold the unique needs and interests of the ASEAN region. Cuba, for its part, reaffirmed the right of countries to produce and import weapons consistent with national economic and security interests. India’s delegation had a cautionary reaction to the ATT, believing that “prospects for a viable and effective outcome would be enhanced only if the interests of all stakeholders are addressed in a transparent and consensus-based process.

Malaysia was one of the states that raised issues both of trafficking in arms and of their diversion—the impor-

*continued on next page*



## Missiles and anti-missile systems

Alicia Godsberg | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

Few countries discussed the issues of missiles and anti-missile systems during the opening week of First Committee. Of the 77 statements made during the first week, only five countries (the Russian Federation, France, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and Iraq) and two groups of states (the European Union and Non-Aligned Movement) discussed these subjects.

### *Stemming ballistic missile proliferation*

Ambassador Eric Danon of France argued that mobilization to combat ballistic missile proliferation is not merely a matter of international security, but is necessary to prevent nuclear disarmament from being “offset by a new arms race.” Ambassador Danon stated that one of the three draft resolutions France will present to First Committee this year is on the Hague Code of Conduct Against the Proliferation of Ballistic Missiles (HCOC), which he called “one of the rare multilateral instruments that combats the proliferation of ballistic missiles,” strengthening security through trust- and confidence-building measures. Ambassador Danon also expressed France’s commitment to making the HCOC and its implementation universal.

The delegates from Turkey and the European Union also expressed support for the universalization of HCOC, with the Turkish representative noting his government’s concern with the progressively increasing range and accuracy of ballistic missiles. Ambassador Khalid A. Al-Nafisee of Saudi Arabia highlighted his country’s participation in HCOC meetings since its inception in 2002 and said that his government encourages countries possessing ballistic missiles in the Middle East to support the Code’s efforts. The representative of Iraq mentioned her nation’s recent accession as the 131st member to the HCOC. Ambassador Jean Lint of Belgium read a statement on behalf of the European Union that welcomed Iraq’s accession to the HCOC and voiced support for further examining multilateral steps to prevent the proliferation of missiles and “to promote disarmament efforts in the missile field.” To that end, Ambassador Lint added without further elaboration, “Our proposal to start consultations on a treaty banning short and intermediate range ground-to-ground missiles remains valid.”

On behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, Ambassador Kleib of Indonesia expressed the need for a “multilaterally negotiated, universal, comprehensive, transparent, and non-discriminatory approach toward the issue of missiles in all its aspects” for international peace and security.

Noticeably absent was any reference from the Russian Federation on the universalization of the Treaty on Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces (INF), which it had promoted in the previous three years. In 2007, the US and Russian delegations issued a joint statement calling for interested countries to discuss the possibility of inter-

nationalizing the INF, which would call for the “renunciation of ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles with ranges between 500 and 5,500 kilometers.”

### *Ballistic missile defences*

The Russian Federation was the only country to mention ballistic missile defence systems in its statement during the first week of Committee this year. Ambassador Anatoly I. Antonov of the Russian Federation stated that further steps toward nuclear disarmament, such as the development of regional missile defence systems, should be considered and implemented taking the security of neighboring states into consideration. The Ambassador also called for a “broad international dialogue on missile defense issues,” with a goal of establishing a “collective system to respond to missile-related challenges by countering missile proliferation and preventing the existing missile related challenges from turning into real missile related threats.” He mentioned the increasing importance of the interrelationship between strategic offensive and strategic defensive arms in the context of reductions in strategic offensive arms and the need to strengthen strategic stability. •

### *Arms trade treaty (cont.)*

tant question of how to prevent weapons transfers from falling into the hands of “unauthorized recipients”—including terrorists and criminals. Uruguay has been a strong advocate of an ATT, and Ambassador Cancela reiterated his country’s “firm support” for a ban on the illicit arms trade, which he called “the true WMD”. For its part, Peru’s delegation raised the need for “total transparency” in the arms trade as a way of building trust in a future ATT. Peru was equally clear that the control and limitation of small weapons and conventional arms would greatly benefit social development.

The EU statement, made by Ambassador Jean Lint of Belgium, provided one of the few statements that combined issue preferences with a concrete proposal for outreach and action. While noting its firm commitment to negotiating a “legally binding international instrument” that sets the “highest common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional weapons,” the EU also announced that it would launch a new round of “regional outreach seminars” with UNIDIR to help clarify regional obligations and highlight regional resources.

Speaking on behalf of the Rio Group, but echoing the sentiments of other states, Ambassador Octavio Errazuriz of Chile called on states “to work in a transparent, gradual and non-discriminatory manner, and on the basis of consensus in the elaboration of a balanced and effective Arms Trade Treaty.” •

## Small arms and light weapons

Jimmy Wall | International Action Network on Small Arms

During the opening week of First Committee, nearly every delegation made a reference to small arms and light weapons (SALW). Several delegations highlighted the impact SALW proliferation has on women's rights, abuses of human rights, obstruction of justice, increased rates of poverty, and as an obstacle to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Deputy Permanent Representative of Thailand, Mr. Jakkrit Sri-Vali, said that SALW "acquisition and accumulation not only pose a serious threat to international peace and security, but also lead to 'backward development' in many of the poorest regions of the world." He also noted that no conflict-affected country has achieved any of the MDGs. Delegations also made references to the consequences of SALW such as increased political instability and exacerbated conflicts.

Ambassador Mary Flores of Honduras dedicated the majority of her remarks to the impact of SALW on her country. She noted that in some cases, due to the unrestricted circulation of arms, criminals have been better equipped than national forces in the region. She estimated that some 12 million SALWs are in circulation in Latin America. Ambassador Joy Ogwu of Nigeria approximated the number of illicit SALW in the West African subregion to be around 7 million.

Nearly every country that addressed SALW referenced the UN Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in SALW (PoA). Several countries, including Japan, Kazakhstan, Nigeria, South Africa, Switzerland, Congo, and Brazil have vowed to strengthen the PoA. The PoA has become, as Colombia stated, "an international benchmark for the progress in the fight against illicit trade in these weapons." Colombia will coordinate with South Africa and Japan in introducing this year's omnibus draft resolution on SALW.

On the whole, most delegations were pleased with the outcomes of the Fourth Biennial Meeting of States (BMS4), especially in regards to the implementation of the PoA. Thailand's delegation in particular commended the "hard work at BMS ... which was able to achieve substantive progress in putting the PoA back on track and strengthen ... efforts to combat trafficking in SALW."

However, Dr. A.K. Momen, the Permanent Representative from Bangladesh, noted, "Progress in [the PoA's] implementation ... has been uneven. Full implementation of the Program of Action, therefore, is of paramount importance for all societies." The Non-Aligned Movement, African Group, Rio Group, European Union, and the Association of South East Asian Nations all expressed the need to strengthen and develop a legally-binding instrument in order to stop the proliferation of SALW. Ambassador Guriérrez of Peru likened the abundance of arms as a "maelstrom". Delegates from Chile, Honduras,

Jamaica, Uruguay, Congo, and Egypt all expressed the importance of marking and tracing arms as a method of control and regulation. A few delegations articulated the need to also regulate ammunition for SALW. UN High Representative for Disarmament Affairs Sergio Durante, remarked that there are "determined efforts ... underway to establish and maintain some basic norms against the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons, and to strengthen controls on stockpiles of ammunition." Several countries, including the Maldives, Uganda, and Malaysia, recognized the need for national and regional regulations to stem the flow of illicit SALW and suggested that such initiatives could be strengthened through UN support.

The delegation from the Democratic Republic of the Congo declared that it has made significant progress on implementing the PoA, having destroyed some 106,000 SALW and 672 tonnes of munitions. Additionally there was a widespread call from the Non-Aligned Movement, Burkina Faso in particular, for the need of technical and financial assistance for countries being overrun with SALW proliferation. The Nigerian delegation, speaking on behalf of the African Group, called for the full implementation of the PoA to be vigorously pursued. Additionally, the African Group drew attention to the "necessity of focusing more on the needs of the developing countries for technical and financial empowerment to enable them address [sic] adequately the menace of illicit SALW." •

### Outer space (cont.)

from previous years. Last year, the United States, which had voted against this resolution since 2005, switched its vote to an abstention, marking a slight shift in policy. The US delegation did not participate in the vote on Russia's annual TCBM resolution last year, explaining that its space policy was currently under review.

This year, the US delegation highlighted its new national space policy under the Obama administration and stated that this new policy reaffirms a commitment by the US to cooperate with other nations to maintain the freedom of space and thereby enhance the welfare of humankind. The new space policy says that the US shall pursue bilateral and multilateral transparency and confidence-building measures to encourage responsible action in, and the peaceful uses of, space. It also notes that the US will consider proposals and concepts for arms control measures if they are "equitable, effectively verifiable, and enhance the national security of the US and its allies". While this is a significant departure from the previous policy under the Bush administration, it still places prerequisites, such as "equitable"—a difficult concept to define—on any future arms control proposals. •



## Cluster munitions

Allison Pytlak | *Religions for Peace, a member of the Cluster Munition Coalition*

More than twenty countries promoted the 2008 Convention on Cluster Munitions during the General Debate of the UN First Committee, giving a strong indication of the momentum that surrounds the Convention, which continues to be seen by many as a positive example of multi-lateral cooperation.

The European Union, the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), Australia, Canada, Chile, Jamaica, Lebanon, Mexico, New Zealand, Philippines, Senegal, Switzerland, and South Africa took note of the Convention's entry into force on 1 August 2010, which was triggered just fourteen months after it first opened for signature—a very rapid pace compared with other international treaties.

As the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Sergio Duarte, stated, “On 1 August the world welcomed the entry into force of the Convention on Cluster Munitions.”

A few signatory states used the opportunity to give an update on the status of ratification. Kenya announced that it is in the midst of ratification. Switzerland also stated that it is in the process of ratifying the Convention and said that it intends to play a leading role in implementation. The Philippines and South Africa acknowledged their signatory status and Jamaica noted that it will soon “take its place” as a state party. Qatar, a state that has yet to join, noted that it is “examining” the Convention.

ASEAN, Australia, Chile, Japan, , New Zealand, and South Africa welcome the upcoming First Meeting of States Parties (IMSP) that will take place next month in Vientiane, Lao People's Democratic Republic from 9–12 November. Lao PDR is a highly appropriate place for this meeting as it is the most bombed country, per capita, in the world. Japan noted that as one of two states party in the Asia-Pacific region (Lao PDR being the other), it will cooperate with Laos to achieve a successful outcome. This IMSP will set the course for implementation of the Convention and as such it was positive to hear it referenced by these delegations, as well as the High Representative Duarte.

All governments are thus encouraged to make use of the opportunity provided by the First Committee to give updates on the status of their ratification of the Convention, intentions to accede and also to participate at the IMSP. Another opportunity will be on 19 October when the Permanent Missions of Lao PDR and Japan co-host a side event about the Convention and importance of the IMSP. •

## Landmines

Allison Pytlak | *Religions for Peace, a member of the International Campaign to Ban Landmines*

Over ten years ago the Ottawa Convention broke ground in the field of disarmament when it placed humanitarian needs ahead of military utility and forged a new model for multilateral and multi-stakeholder negotiation. References to the Convention or anti-personnel landmines during the opening week of First Committee reflected the steady progression to a mine free world, as many statements focused on updates on implementation status or emphasized the need for continued international assistance and cooperation to complete implementation. Discussion on these subjects also represents a tangible intersection point between disarmament that truly promotes development.

An update on universalization was given by Mongolia's delegation, which stated that recently the prime minister “re-affirmed” Mongolia's intention to accede to the Convention. Furthermore, the statement noted that Mongolia laid the “groundwork for accession via a step-by-step approach that has involved amending legislation” in relation to stockpile destruction, which is an obligation of the Convention.

Turkey, provided an updated on its process of stockpile destruction, which is on-going. Turkey, as well as Belarus, Greece, and Ukraine missed their deadlines for stockpile destruction and remain in violation of the Convention. Updates on clearance efforts were provided by Peru, Tanzania, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Ethiopia, which also noted that it had submitted its annual transparency report. The Rio Group and Mexico both congratulated Nicaragua for having recently completed clearance of all its mine affected areas, resulting in all Central America being a mine-free region. Iraq provided an update on working with the United Nations Development Program to clear Iraq of the estimated 25 million mines within its borders. Iraq will also host an exhibition about its clearance efforts from 18–22 October within the UN Secretariat.

In 2009, the government of Colombia hosted the Cartagena Summit for a Mine Free World, which was the second Review Conference for the Ottawa Convention. The resulting Cartagena Action Plan sets out concrete commitments for the next five years and was acknowledged in the statements of the European Union, the Non-Aligned Movement, Colombia, and Switzerland. The government of Colombia has also recently submitted to its Congress a bill to establish “an effective and broad policy for reparation to the victims of violence, which will also benefit those who have suffered the effects of landmines.”

Of course, successful implementation of the Convention requires financial and technical support. The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), Rio Group, Bangladesh, and South Africa made this point in their statements.

## Disarmament machinery

Beatrice Fihn | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

With First Committee following so closely after the recent high-level meeting on “Revitalizing the work of the Conference on Disarmament and taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations”, an overwhelming majority of delegations expressed concern over the disarmament machinery and in particular the stalemate in the Conference on Disarmament (CD).

### *The high-level meeting and the CD*

During the opening week, most speakers welcomed the convening by the UN Secretary-General of the high-level meeting. Thailand’s delegation argued that the meeting was a sign of a growing political will to move beyond the CD’s “business as usual”. While many delegations, such as the European Union, the United States, and the Philippines expressed support for the outcome of the meeting, the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) believed that the summary presented by the UN Secretary-General should have duly reflected the views of participating states. NAM also argued that any possible follow-up should be “inclusive, Member States driven, and should strengthen the role and work of the CD.”

Just as at the high-level meeting, delegates highlighted differences in opinions concerning the problems and potential solutions. Liechtenstein’s representative argued that the current disarmament machinery no longer is fit for its purpose and the Norwegian deputy minister of foreign affairs stated that both the CD and the UN Disarmament Commission (UNDC) are “highly dysfunctional bodies today”. Brazil’s ambassador, on the other hand, argued, “the difficulties that confront the CD do not stem from its rules of procedure, nor from its consensus rule. In the past, those same rules did not prevent us from agreeing to launch negotiations, even when certain substantive differences remained”. South Africa also highlighted that disarmament instruments have been negotiated in the CD previously, and argued that no one therefore could claim that the structure of the CD does not allow for negotiations to take place. France’s ambassador reminded delegations that work in the CD was suspended as a result of political animosity and posited that procedural improvements would not be enough to end the deadlock.

Despite disagreeing on the reason for the deadlock, some delegations still suggested concrete measures for moving forward. Liechtenstein proposed that the General Assembly (GA)- consider a resolution that would put a one year deadline on the CD to commence work, and, if this deadline is not met, the GA should reconsider the role of the CD and the disarmament machinery. The idea of a deadline was supported by the Mexican delegation, which argued that it was “unacceptable that resources and efforts continue to be deployed to fuel exercise of non-existent diplomacy” and suggested that the time has come to give an ultimatum. Canada’s delegation noted,

“the clock is ticking loudly” and emphasized successful negotiating models such as the Mine Ban Treaty, the Convention on Cluster Munitions, and the new process towards an Arms Trade Treaty as alternative models for moving forward. The US, Japanese, and Australian delegations declared that if negotiations of a Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT) continue to stall, other options for moving forward would have to be considered. Peru’s delegation said it would not stand in the way of other negotiating initiatives that attempt to constructively bring us forward, saying, “we can’t afford to backtrack.”

However, Turkey’s ambassador argued, “second-track initiatives or new formations, where the participation of all concerned parties is not granted, will fail to bring about the desired outcomes.” Likewise, Algeria’s delegation claimed that another forum would strip the CD of its obligations, set a dangerous precedent, and question the balance between the items on the CD agenda. Cuba’s representative argued that the solution was not to disregard the CD, saying that today more than ever states have a duty to preserve and strengthen it. China’s ambassador stated that the CD’s position and role is irreplaceable and argued that any revitalization attempts must preserve and strengthen CD’s authority and position while respecting and upholding CD’s rules of procedure, particularly its consensus rule.

Aside from the discussion on parallel processes, some speakers made suggestions for moving forward within the CD. Switzerland’s Ambassador Lauber suggested that a revitalization of the current debate was needed in order to pursue a holistic approach, which not only includes strict security policy and military considerations. The Swiss delegation proposed simultaneous negotiations on FMCT and negative security assurances and urged all CD members to reconvene in 2011 and agree on a new approach for operating. Ambassador Grinius from Canada, the first president of the 2011 session, announced that he has initiated consultations with the current CD president and stated that the Canadian approach to the Presidency would be “focused but flexible, and willing to consider innovative ways to advance the disarmament agenda.”

Other suggestions concerned the CD’s lack of transparency and inclusiveness. Colombia, Kazakhstan, Thailand, ASEAN, Philippines, Lesotho and Chile argued that the CD should consider expansion of its membership and many of these delegations also called specifically for the appointment of a Special Coordinator to deal with this issue in its 2011 session. Chile also emphasized the importance of assigning a proper role to civil society in the CD.

### *Fourth special session on disarmament (SSOD IV)*

The NAM reaffirmed its position on the urgent need to convene a SSOD IV, and said it expected that the cur-

*continued on next page*



## Regional disarmament and security

Isabelle Cutting and Natalia Pombo | NGO  
Committee on Disarmament, Peace and Security

Many delegates at the opening week of First Committee highlighted the value and unmet potential of regional efforts to create confidence-building measures and achieve disarmament, non-proliferation, and security. Several issued support to regional disarmament fora and organizations within and outside of the UN.

Welcoming cooperation between the UN and the African Union, the representative of the Congo expressed support for the UN regional centres for peace and disarmament. Ambassador Ertugrul Apakan of Turkey commended the centres for not only “promoting the implementation of existing international disarmament and arms control norms at the regional and sub-regional levels,” but for encouraging “regional dialogue for further openness, transparency, and confidence building.”

Ms. Josephine Ojiambo, Deputy Permanent Representative of Kenya, also praised the Central African region and the Regional Centre on Small Arms for their efforts relating to small arms and light weapons (SALW), which the Ugandan delegation recognized as having a particularly destabilizing effect on regional security. Uganda subsequently called for continued international support for regional activities in this domain.

Ambassador Gyan Chandra Acharya of Nepal expressed further support for regional security initiatives by announcing his intention to table another resolution on the UN Regional Centre in Asia and the Pacific. He expressed his hope that the Centre “will be able to respond to the needs of Member States in the region and intensify its activities in collaboration with Member States and other stakeholders in the region.” Algeria’s delegation similarly signaled that it would introduce a resolution on enhancing security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region and highlighted the Pelindaba Treaty’s critical contribution to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

Amidst this enthusiasm, Ambassador Michele Kafando of Burkina Faso noted that insufficient resources seriously handicap interstate cooperation on disarmament. He called upon the international community to support ECOWAS in its provision of technical and financial resources as well as training related to disarmament.

Delegates also proposed increasing the number of mechanisms for achieving regional security. Mr. Ak-soltan Atayeva of Turkmenistan expressed the need to create a standing forum for political dialogue on disarmament in Central Asia under the auspices of the UN. The delegation of Uruguay announced its intention to hold a regional conference in Montevideo in November to address the Security General’s five-point proposal on nuclear disarmament. •

## *Disarmament machinery (cont.)*

rent session of the First Committee would take concrete action to actualize this goal. While recognizing challenges facing the disarmament machinery, the African Group reaffirmed its strong belief in the current machinery and argued for the convening of an SSOD IV in order to address these challenges comprehensively. The US delegation, on the other hand, called on to cease “the pointless calls for convening a fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, for which there is no international consensus.”

### *The Disarmament Commission (UNDC) and the First Committee*

While the CD was the main focus, some delegations also took the opportunity to comment on the UNDC and First Committee. The NAM, the African Group, and Venezuela all reaffirmed their support for the UNDC. The African Group noted that the UNDC will enter the final year of its current three-year cycle, and called upon all member states to show flexibility and adequate political will to create an atmosphere sufficiently favourable to a consensus outcome, while Venezuela encouraged the intensification of work of the UNDC, and suggested that it should foster understandings leading up to a SSOD IV.

The EU called for the First Committee to improve its working methods in order to be capable of debating contemporary security challenges and to develop concrete measures to address them. Liechtenstein argued that the First Committee also needs to rethink its work and stated that “a significant number of resolutions are presented each year without open consultations, only to be voted on, strictly along bloc lines, and in a strongly ritualised manner.” Liechtenstein’s delegation called for improved measures, such as open consultations wherever possible and pointed out the lack of opportunities for civil-society to engage in disarmament negotiations. •

## First Committee Calendar of Events

[www.reachingcriticalwill.org](http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org)

*Updated daily*

Email [info@reachingcriticalwill.org](mailto:info@reachingcriticalwill.org)  
to list your event



## Disarmament and development

Ray Acheson | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

During the opening week of First Committee, a number of delegations expressed their alarm over rising global military expenditure in the face of an economic crisis, growing poverty and inequalities, and the realization that the Millennium Development Goals will not be achieved by 2015. The increased spending on weapons and wars also acts as a material deterrent to disarmament and, as the majority of concerned states complained, undermines development and exacerbates tensions and conflicts.

“Determined leadership from States with the largest investments in weaponry—leadership in further reducing their arsenals, limiting their arms exports, and cutting back military spending” will be “indispensable in sustaining or increasing the momentum for disarmament over the years ahead,” said Sergio Duarte, UN High Representative for Disarmament Affairs. Unfortunately, worldwide military expenditure reached an estimated 1531 billion USD, which is an increase of 5.9 percent in real terms compared to 2008 and an increase of 49 percent since 2000. Of those countries for which data was available, 65 percent increased their military spending in real terms in 2009.

These numbers signal that the culture of a perpetual arms race persists today, twenty years after the end of the Cold War. Describing the excessive accumulation and development of weapons as “irrational,” Peru’s Ambassador Gutiérrez acknowledged that people will always find arguments to continue the arms race but encouraged the international community to “explore mechanisms to help curb this maelstrom of arms purchases”. For example, Peruvian President Garcia has suggested that multilateral financial institutions include clauses or conditions against the arms race when they grant loans.

Other delegates thought that a more fundamental shift in international thinking is required in order to combat the challenges of military spending and overarmament. Honduran Ambassador Flores argued that disarmament should be connected directly to the maintenance of peace and security. Thailand’s representative agreed, stating, “security can never be achieved by stockpiling and usage of weapons, but by ensuring their control and elimination.” Both of these delegations further linked disarmament and security with development, suggesting that the overarmament impedes social and economic development both directly, by wasting financial and human resources, and indirectly, by the exacerbation of armed conflict.

Several others emphasized these connections, including the Non-Aligned Movement, the Caribbean Community, the Rio Group, Bangladesh, Congo, Cuba, Ethiopia, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Libya, Nepal, Nigeria, Peru, and Qatar. They all called for a reduction of military expenditure to meet human needs and achieve the Millennium Development Goals. “Over a billion people live in pov-

erty and hunger,” remarked Ambassador Acharya of Nepal. “Still, our precious yet scarce resources are consistently being diverted towards the procurement, research and development of ever sophisticated weapons system. This runs contrary to our moral standing. It is not enhancing our common security.” Jamaica’s Ambassador Wolfe submitted “that redirecting significant portions of military expenditure to developmental issues will have a greater global effect on international peace and security in the long run.” Cuba’s delegation reiterated its proposal for all countries to reallocate at least half of their current military expenditure to development through a UN managed fund. Many of these states and others also contributed their views to the UN Secretary-General’s report on disarmament and development.

Tanzania’s Ambassador Sefue brought the debate full circle with his examination of “development as an incentive to end conflicts and disarm.” He explained, “In post-conflict societies, development and opportunity are the best anchors and guarantee of disarmament and sustainable peace.” His comments reflect the growing understanding that disarmament, development, and security need to be considered together in order to achieve all three. This perspective is catching on in many debates within the disarmament community, with many governments pushing for a rearticulation of security and a realignment of priorities to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

Civil society has likewise been calling for the redefinition of security and the redirection of military expenditures to meet human and environmental needs, through publications, statements, and most recently, a petition. Young leaders from the world’s great religious traditions convened in New York on 4 October to deliver a petition signed by more than 20 million people from 140 countries to Mr. Duarte. The petition calls on all governments to officially pledge to cut their military budgets by 10 percent and re-allocate those funds toward development. The event—co-sponsored by the Permanent Mission of Costa Rica to the United Nations—was the culmination of the first phase of the Arms Down! Campaign for Shared Security. •

### Landmines (cont.)

All states, including those who have not yet joined the Convention, are strongly encouraged to vote for the annual resolution “Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Landmines and on their Destruction” which will be presented by Norway, Albania, and Switzerland. This is a non-binding way to show support for the humanitarian aims of Convention as we move into the next decade of implementation. •