



# News In Review



A collection of NGO views on the NPT PrepCom 2003

May 23, 2003 - No. 11

UN Office: 777 UN Plaza, New York, NY 10017. phone (212) 682-1265 Fax: (212) 286-8211 E-mail: wilpfun@igc.org

Int Secretariat: 1, rue de Varembe, C.P.28, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland. Phone: (+41 22)919-7080 E-mail: wilpf@iprolink.ch

## This Is What Reporting Looks Like: Assessing the Chairman's Factual Summary

The 2003 Preparatory Committee for the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty has convened and dispersed, leaving behind a stack of predictable statements, a dozen or so working papers on proposed courses of action to strengthen the non-proliferation regime, and, of course, a Factual Summary written by the Hungarian delegation which chaired the meeting. (As always, all available documents can be downloaded at

[www.reachingcriticalwill.org/npt/nptindex.html](http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/npt/nptindex.html).)

How factual was the Factual Summary? Well, the majority of States Parties seem to be satisfied with it at least. In order to avoid hefty criticism upon delivery of the Summary, Chairman Molnar consulted with what has been referred to as "key delegations" in the preparation of the Summary. The result was a rather weak, diluted report on the proceedings of the two weeks. The 19 States Parties that publicly responded to the Summary (China, the United States, Russia, Greece on behalf of the European Union, France, the United Kingdom, New Zealand on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition, Ireland, Syria, Egypt, Germany, Brazil, Malaysia, Japan, Australia, Iran, Cuba, South Korea, and Uzbekistan) had relatively few qualms with the 10 page text, preferring stronger wording here or there, expressing disappointment with insufficient attention to their issue of choice, or, in the case of Ambassador de la Fortelle, calling for more Francophonic participation. For a complete summary of the responses, see Rebecca Johnson's article at: <http://www.acronym.org.uk/npt/index.htm> (Excerpts are also reprinted here on page 2).

A fair, balanced, accurate, and, most importantly, useful Chairman's Factual Summary should reflect the diversity of opinion, hopes, efforts, and politics that were expressed and

exercised at the PrepCom. The Summary should be viewed as a transparency measure for the world, an unbiased window into the opaque proceedings. It should look not only at what issues were discussed, but it should also expose the position taken by each country on the issues. What arguments were brought up in the defense of a proposal? What arguments were given against it, and by whom? People have a right to ask: what is my country doing for non-proliferation and disarmament, and why?

Granted, the task of compiling a summary of deliberations between nearly 200 states is an extremely daunting task, that only an uber-diplomat could even dare to tackle. In full agreement with the 19 states that responded, NGOs recognize what an enormous challenge the Summary is, and we applaud Ambassador Molnar for his efforts.

Nonetheless, the NGOs following the PrepCom in Geneva felt that the text did not accurately reflect the arguments that had been presented. A balanced and accurate reporting of the States Parties dialogue would enlighten readers to the politics behind each State Party's position on the issues. Paragraph 21, for instance, reads that "Many States Parties recalled that regular reports should be submitted by all States Parties. It was stressed that such reporting would promote increased confidence in the overall nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty regime through transparency. It was also expressed that such transparency provides valuable means to address and respond to compliance concerns. States parties recognized the value of reports and used them in substantive deliberation, in line with their wish for enhanced interaction." This summary statement lacks any mention of the adamant position of some States

*continued on page 2*

**News In Review is funded by Ploughshares Fund, The Simons Foundation, The Ford Foundation & others**

*All articles contained in News In Review are the sole responsibility of the author or organization submitting the pieces. The opinions herein are not necessarily those of the Editors, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) or the Reaching Critical Will project.*

Parties against standardizing such a vehicle for transparency and confidence-building.

The lengthy paragraph 29 on Negative Security Assurances (NSAs), likewise, fails to reflect the position of States like the U.S. and U.K. against codifying NSAs. The effect again is that a reader is left ignorant of the obstacles facing such codification. As a result of the Summary's failure to incorporate the reservations expressed against codifying this important confidence-building measure (CBM), it seems as though agreement was reached, and that Non-Nuclear Weapon States (NNWS) will have their NSA any day now.

Other paragraphs are misleading in other ways. Paragraph 2, for instance, portrays a unanimous commitment to non-proliferation via the 13 Steps that, quite frankly, is just not true. The paragraph states that States Parties stressed their commitment to the effective implementation of the objectives of

the Treaty, the decisions and the resolution of the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference. The U.S., for one, is not committed to the 2000 Review Conference final document, as it repeatedly asserts in its statements. Prior to the start of the PrepCom, many people were anticipating the DPRK's withdrawal to be a major issue discussed in Geneva. Yet from reading the Summary, one would conclude that it was indeed a minor, barely mentioned issue. The sole reference to the DRPK (paragraph 28) lacks any mention of the U.S. and its reneged obligations (both Article VI and Agreed Framework promises) in the Summary's reference to the DPRK withdrawal. If States Parties were hoping to lure the DPRK back to the NPT family, exonerating the U.S. by ignoring the role that it played in the withdrawal was surely detrimental to the cause.

There was, however, one other legacy of the 2003 Preparatory Committee. In addition to the statements, working papers, and

*continued on page 5*

## Impressions from Geneva

Alice Slater, GRACE, Abolition 2000

While governments, in their diplomatic dance in the marbled halls of the Palais des Nations in Geneva, could never have matched NGO expectations for what was required to call the US to account for its shocking assault on NPT norms for nuclear disarmament, civil society, energized from its engagement in the worldwide action against the war on Iraq, was particularly focussed and coherent at this PrepCom. Gone were the nuanced arguments for arms control versus nuclear abolition that we have endured since the 1995 Review and Extension conference. It was then that the Abolition 2000 Network was founded based on the fervent wishes of the majority of NGOs for a clearer statement of purpose, and a practical way forward for the elimination of nuclear weapons—a purpose not reflected in the bargain struck at the 1995 NPT meeting to obtain the indefinite extension of the NPT.

In a series of panels, roundtables, and seminars, as well as in the formal presentation to the delegates, NGOs were able to show their stuff, bringing insights, technical know-how, poetry, and passion to the attention of the governments and their own colleagues. In topics ranging from nuclear disarmament and gender, the toxic legacy of the nuclear age, the dangers of civilian nuclear power, the latest developments about what new lethal brew of nuclear weapons the Dr.

Strangeloves had in store for us, the US drive to dominate and control the military use of space and its collusion with other governments to do so, we couldn't have been better informed. Sadly, in the grand tradition of disarmament conferences, perverted by the concept of the national security state, the doors were closed in our faces as the governments met in secret to hammer out a compromise that would enable the badly battered treaty to survive to the next PrepCom in New York in 2004.

Outside the halls of the UN we enjoyed the Greenpeace weapon inspectors dressed as missiles who visited many of the UN missions, and were pleased to see the giant IPPNW blow-up of a nuclear reactor with its phallic companion, a nuclear missile, floating near the huge iron sculpture of a broken-legged chair, commemorating the horrors of landmines, outside the Palais. The nuclear reactor brazenly wore the banner, Nuclear Power Powers the Bomb—a message, that unfortunately, has yet to register with most of the NPT parties, many of whom kept referring to the inalienable right to peaceful nuclear technologies, despite North Korea's withdrawal from the NPT to build bombs from its civilian stores of nuclear materials as well as natural-

*continued on page 3*

gas-and-oil- rich Iran with its newly announced intention to build nuclear power plants.

Ambassador Molnar, who chaired the session with great skill, noted that this conference could not be business as usual . Echoing his remarks, at our Abolition 2000 General Meeting, after the first week of the NPT PrepCom, we laid out a series of strategies that would push us to the next level, including an effort to make sure that at least 2000 NGOs show up at the 2004 PrepCom in New York, and to create support for the Mayor of Hiroshima s initiative to gather cities around the world to push for a nuclear disarmament conference, perhaps building on Kofi Annan s call for a Millenium Conference to Eliminate Nuclear Dangers. We also plan to promote a boycott of US products and set up a new working group for Citizen Inspections Teams which will issue reports to the 2004 PrepCom particularly about the NATO countries, which are sharing US nuclear weapons. To see some other initiatives and how you can participate, check out [www.abolition2000.org](http://www.abolition2000.org).

Alice Slater, President  
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment (GRACE) and a founder of Abolition 2000

## So now that the PrepCom is over...

...Talking with Carol Naughton, Chair  
Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament,  
United Kingdom

*What were your expectations, how have they changed?*

The biggest surprise, for me, was the openness of the hostility shown to Iran from the US and the U.K.. I felt the use of language "serious consequences" etc was a deliberate marker for war on Iran and to discredit the IAEA findings.

*What, from this experience, will you bring to next year's PrepCom?*

My expectations for 2005 have been scaled down following this PrepCom. CND will be concentrating on 'compliance' and 'transparency' as a way to strengthen the achievements in 2000 and be pushing hard up to, and during, 2005 to stop back peddling by the NWS. We will definitely use the campaign of enhanced 'Citizens Inspections' with the objective of giving clear presentations to the 2004 PrepCom 'outing' the nuclear states.

*What were the major disappointments, surprises, etc.?*

What did I gain? Inspiration from spending a week in the company of so many intelligent, clear thinking and committed people!! Thank you.

## MPI: Advancing the Practical Thirteen Steps -Dr. Urs Cipolat, Program Director, Middle Powers Initiative

The goal of the Middle Powers Initiative (MPI), a coalition of eight international advocacy groups, is to reinforce so-called middle power governments in their efforts to encourage the nuclear-weapon states to fulfill their commitments under the NPT and take immediate practical steps that reduce nuclear dangers. In accordance with this mission, MPI over the past five years has built a close working relationship with the New Agenda Coalition (NAC). Together, the substantive work of these like-minded governments and civil society experts helped move the nuclear disarmament agenda forward at the 2000 Review Conference. Together, MPI's Chair Senator Douglas Roche now hopes, the two groups will again be able to make a substantial contribution to the 2005 Review Conference.

"Let us keep in mind a core statement of the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference – namely, that 'the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use and threat of use of nuclear weapons'," Roche stated at MPI's recent Strategy Consultation in Geneva. "This is the central message MPI and the NAC must get into peoples' heads between now and 2005."

The Consultation, which was held on April 25 in connection with the 2003 PrepCom, was well attended. In addition to the representatives of 20 plus middle power countries, including Australia, Germany, Italy, Japan, Morocco, Spain, Turkey and the NAC, more than 30 NGO representatives and observers participated in the 3 hour discussion behind closed doors.

Dr. Tadatashi Akiba, Mayor of Hiroshima and key note speaker at the Consultation, underscored Roche's call for continued close cooperation between likeminded NGOs and governments. "Civil society and elected leaders must pull together and approach the 2005 NPT Review Conference with absolute determination to strengthen the non-proliferation regime and stop the trend toward nuclear proliferation," Akiba stated. "The development of new nuclear weapons by the nuclear-

## *excerpts from* Final Interim Report *from the Acronym Institute*

### Chair's Factual Summary and responses

(This section should be read in conjunction with the text of the Chair's summary. Unless otherwise specified, all quotes are from my notes of this final, open session of the PrepCom, as few statements were distributed.)

Unlike the first PrepCom in 2002, Mólnár's summary was, to some extent negotiated, at least with some of the key states, which ensured that no-one would seek to block its attachment to the PrepCom report. It ran to 10 pages and 42 paragraphs. Various delegations were solicited to put in text on issues that they had identified as priorities, which were then checked out with other key states that Mólnár felt might have an objection. As a consequence (and notwithstanding the obligatory caveats made at the end), many references were substantially amended and/or watered down. However, the reception was generally favorable.

**China**, the first to respond, thanked the Chair for the factual summary "which we recognize is a difficult task" - (this acknowledgement was made in some form by almost all the speakers) - and said that the session had shown "that countries have different, even contradictory assessments" of the treaty's implementation. For China, balance had not been achieved on two main areas: DPRK and the urging in paragraph 17 to adhere to a moratorium on fissile materials production. Largely repeating its earlier statement on the DPRK, China said this was a "sensitive issue", reiterated its support for the Korean peninsula to be nuclear weapon free, and called for North Korea's "legitimate security concerns" to be addressed. China objected to calls for an "undefined and unverifiable moratorium" on fissile materials production, saying it preferred a "properly negotiated FMCT".

One might, therefore, have expected that the summary would contain a ringing call for the Conference on Disarmament to bypass its various blockages and commence negotiations on a fissban, but instead, paragraph 17 was very mealy mouthed, merely taking "note of a cross-group effort to develop a programme of work". Ambassador Mary Whelan of **Ireland**, current holder of the CD presidency, objected that this paragraph (a better version of which had reportedly suffered from French opposition) did not sufficiently acknowledge the initiative of the Five CD Ambassadors, "which many of us believe offers a way forward". Recognizing, of course, that the Chair's summary was subjective and not consensual, Whelan emphasized that it did not reflect the weight given by states parties to various important issues.

The **United States**, which had been closely consulted on the text of much if not all the Chair's summary, also emphasized that the summary was "not an agreed or abiding text, but represented the

*continued on page 6*

Factual Summary, the NGOs left Geneva with a renewed commitment to better influence the NPT process. Of course, the NGOs were predictably, audibly disappointed with the lack of a unified outrage amongst NNWS toward for recent U.S. proliferation. Where was the condemnation of the U.S.'s blatant vertical proliferation? After the joviality that accompanied and followed Vice-Chair Salander's musical close to the conference, (this year it was a Frank Sinatra rendition) one NGO representative stood helplessly near the entrance of the room, shouting, When's the crying session start? Hello!? When do we collectively cry?

No, we will not collectively weep over the lack of progress, substantial commitments, or objectionable retreat from disarmament commitments. We will simply harness the energy spawned amongst ourselves and the likeminded States Parties, and formulate it into an effective strategy for next year, when a representative from the Non-Aligned Movement will chair the proceedings and consensus-based recommendations will arise for the 2005 Review Conference. We will continue demonstrating for the States Parties what transparency looks like through continued advocacy for reporting and production of an expanded NGO Shadow Report. We will continue demonstrating for them what democracy looks like, through a significantly increased NGO presence in New York, and an increase of citizens weapons inspections around the world. We will continue building bridges between the States Parties and the people whom they purport to represent, by widely expanding our disarmament education projects and initiatives. We will continue educating governments and peoples about the horrors of nuclear weaponry testing and nuclear energy industries.

There's no time for tears; we have a lot of work to do. And distinguished delegates, we'll see you in eleven months.

*Rhianna Tyson*  
*Reaching Critical Will*  
 WILPF

On April 29, the Middle Powers Initiative (MPI) and the Global Security Institute (GSI) hosted a key note address for Mr. Jayantha Dhanapala, who will be leaving his post as Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs this summer. At the event, chaired by Jonathan Granoff, GSI President, Mr. Dhanapala delivered a riveting speech about the past, present, and future of the NPT to the assembled NGOs and diplomats. The full text of his speech can be found on the MPI and RCW websites. "NGOs have been the wind under my wings, while others might have wished to have clipped my wings. NGOs will be the true custodians of whatever may have been accomplished over the past five years," Mr. Dhanapala concluded his remarks. Ditto, dear Under-Secretary-General! Our endless thanks go to you, for your tireless efforts to create a world free of nuclear weapons. We wish you the very best for your future. May your dream, which we all share, become true one day!

## prepcom limerick

by pamela meidell,  
 atomic mirror

There once was a chairman named Laszlo  
 Who believed in the edicts of Maslow\*  
 His request for interactivity  
 Was met by States parties' proclivity  
 to respond just because he had said so.

(\*Abraham Maslow, humanistic psychologist, proposed that human beings had a hierarchy of needs, the highest of which was self-actualization. The list is: 1. The physiological needs, 2. The safety and security needs, 3. The love and belonging needs, 4. The esteem needs, 5. Self-actualization.)

## MPI article continued from page 4

proliferation," the Mayor further observed, concluding his intervention with a passionate call for a complete ban of nuclear weapons by 2005.

Ambassador Laszlo Molnar of Hungary, Chair of the 2003 PrepCom, and Ambassador Tim Caughley of New Zealand, currently coordinating the NAC, in their addresses both stressed the continued relevance of the 13 Practical Steps as a solid roadmap toward full implementation of Article VI. "The 13 Steps were developed and agreed as a means to an end, not as an end in themselves," Caughley reminded the participants. It is precisely for this reason, Molnar and Caughley concluded, that the irrelevance of some of the steps in the new strategic context does not weaken the overall "unequivocal undertaking" the nuclear-weapon states made in 2000 to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals.

According to Rt. Hon. Kim Campbell, former Prime Minister of Canada and Chair of the MPI Consultation in Geneva, the meeting achieved its purpose in spite of an unusually cautious audience. "We called for this Consultation to reaffirm the importance of the 13 Practical Steps and to shore up middle power countries in their efforts to get the nuclear-weapon states back on track," Campbell said after the meeting. "Well, that's what we did and will continue to do until 2005 and beyond."

(The April 2003 MPI Briefing Paper, "Advancing the NPT 13 Practical Steps" and a full Report of the MPI Strategy Consultation in Geneva can be found on MPI's website, [www.middlepowers.org](http://www.middlepowers.org). Senator Roche's comprehensive analysis of the outcome of the 2003 PrepCom, entitled "Ritualistic Façade," is also available on that site.)

## Acronym article continued from page 4

made in the US's first statement (and, reportedly, several other US statements, although these obtainable only to states parties during the PrepCom and so the reports of their contents cannot be substantiated). The US quoted paragraph 34, which dealt chiefly with Iran and the "importance of building confidence in the peaceful character of nuclear activities". The US said that the PrepCom had done more than call for Iran to sign the IAEA's Additional Protocol (INFCIRC 540), arguing that it had "called on Iran to make full, truly transparent disclosure and compliance on all its NPT obligations".

**Iran's** careful response went beyond objecting to being named in the factual summary. Referring to Iran's own history in the past two decades of war and foreign pressure, the Director General for International Political Affairs, Mr Amir Zamaninia, commented on "the inability of the United States to view Iran's peaceful nuclear programme objectively, that is to say, separate from problems [in] our bilateral relations". Zamaninia compared the US approach to Israel -- "a proven and substantiated, established proliferator" and Iran, saying the US showed "double standards". Arguing that, with seven separate interventions accusing Iran during this PrepCom, the US was attempting "to create a quasi-crisis", he wryly commented "I could not bring myself to listening and reading more than the first three"! Iran objected that paragraph 34 of the Chair's summary was tantamount to a "prejudgement" and "namecalling" before the IAEA report on Iran (due in June) had come out. Reiterating some of the points made in Iran's General Debate statement and response to the first US broadside, Zamaninia referred to Iran's "desire and effort to become economically strong and be able to distribute prosperity, where we are not dependent only on the revenue from the sale of oil as a raw material". The Iranian delegation argued that it took questions about its nuclear programme seriously, and referred delegations to the statement by Reza Aghazadeh, Vice President, on "Iran's Nuclear Policy (Peaceful, Transparent, Independent)", delivered at the IAEA Headquarters in Vienna on May 6, 2003 (which was also distributed).

The **US** also repeated its concern about Libya and stressed that the "Article IV benefits are not an entitlement". The **UK** followed the US lead in complaining that the language on Iran was weak, reiterating concern regarding the "scale, scope and lack of transparency" of Iran's programme, "as stressed by some 40 states parties", which is taken to include the EU and associated countries, as well as the US and Australia. The UK also applauded how the Chair had "handled DPRK", which was addressed in paragraph 28 with reference to "a wide range of concerns". The United States said that much more should have been said about the DPRK, for which there was only "one acceptable objective: the verifiable dismantlement of DPRK's nuclear programme [and] the denuclearisation of the Korean peninsula." A few others, including **Australia**, **UK** and **France** emphasised this as well. South Korea fervently hoped that the attention paid to the DPRK-related nuclear issue would provide "favourable grounds for a peaceful resolution" of the crisis.

*continued on page 8*



## WILPF Hosts Panel on Gender and Disarmament

Monday, April 28, 2003. The NPT Prepcom opened with the usual to do. States Parties gave their Capital's speeches in the so-called "general debate", stating little that wasn't already known. The highlight of the day's events though, was the lunchtime panel on Gender and Disarmament, which was hosted by WILPF.

The panel featured Jayantha Dhanapala (Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs), Rebecca Johnson (Executive Director of the Acronym Institute for Disarmament Diplomacy), Cate Buchanan (Project Manager, Center for Humanitarian Dialogue), and Edith Ballantyne (Special Advisor on the UN, WILPF).

Our first speaker, Mr. Dhanapala, spoke about the Department of Disarmament Affairs (DDA) recently released Gender Mainstreaming Action Plan, an effort to implement Security Council Resolution 1325 and mainstream gender throughout the department. Mr. Dhanapala spoke also of the necessity to incorporate women into all phases of the UN and Governments work. Recognizing the unique contribution that can only come from women, he reminded those present that this plan was only the beginning, a step in the right direction.

Rebecca Johnson was the second speaker. She painted three vivid pictures of women taking an active role in the disarmament process, and spoke about three specific disarmament actions led by women. Speaking about the community and strength that ran through the Greenham Women's Camp, those listening were enthralled. Ms. Johnson went on to talk about the leadership role that women have assumed in disarmament movements around the world. Her stories emphasized the humanity of incorporating gender into disarmament work.

Cate Buchanan opened another door on disarmament. Speaking about small arms, she detailed the link between those who have weapons

and those who use them. She reminded the group that when weapons are available they will be used. Ms. Buchanan tied the global spread of violence and small arms to the increase of domestic violence. Recognizing that in a war zone the rates of domestic violence increase dramatically. She emphasized the importance of including women's voices in all parts of pre- and post-conflict dialogue. Ms. Buchanan reminded the audience of the unique perspective that women have in regards to conflict and weaponry.

Edith Ballantyne was the last speaker on the panel. She gave a brief history of WILPF's work regarding disarmament and peace. She then began a brief dialogue among the panelists about the word "gender" and its implications. Noting that her own perspective on "gender" had been strongly influenced by the speakers on the panel, she spoke about the importance of not losing sight of women in the discussion of gender. Ms. Ballantyne also made it a point to thank the panelists for not losing sight of women in the gender dialogue.

Altogether the panel was very well attended, with members of several States Parties delegations in attendance. The informal dialogue which followed the panel was lively and hopeful. Most of those participating recognized the importance of including women's voices in disarmament discussions. It will be left to see whether or not those words will be put into action.

Susi Snyder  
Co-Director  
WILPF UN Office

Although there were paragraphs covering reductions in nuclear weapons, the disposal of fissile materials, cooperative threat reduction, and the G-8 initiative, the United States said it would have liked to see a more positive report on such progress: "these achievements are truly remarkable and the factual summary should have reflected this better." The US took particular exception to paragraph 11, which emphasised commitment to the 13 steps, saying that the US had "made clear this year and last year that it does not support all the 13 steps". It also objected to the references to the ABM Treaty (para 15) and the CTBT (para 14), noting that it had exercised its right to withdraw from the ABM Treaty and was now "continuing our legal development of missile defences" and that contrary to the views of many, missile defences were "stabilising and enhanced deterrence". Furthermore, "the US does not support the CTBT and does not intend to proceed with ratification" although there was reiteration of the statement that it is not pursuing further tests. As far as the US was concerned, there was no connection between slow progress on nuclear disarmament and the growth of proliferation threats, and "compliance with Articles II and III are at the NPT's heart".

Russia referred to Molnar's "able and professional leadership", and said the summary sufficiently reflected the issues discussed. However, Russia objected to part of paragraph 26, which referred to remaining "unsolved questions regarding Iraq's programmes of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery". Russia considered that instead of merely taking note of the IAEA's readiness to resume its verification activities in Iraq (a phrasing that the US had reportedly insisted on) "a more accurate point would have reflected that some states parties welcomed the IAEA's readiness to resume its inspection activities in Iraq". Russia also insisted on reiterating points it has made at other times in the PrepCom about non-strategic nuclear weapons (NSNW), disassociating itself with how this issue had been characterised in paragraph 16. Russia quoted from the 13 steps and underlined that the step on NSNW "should be implemented in a way that strengthens international stability and undiminished security" and that disassociating NSNW from other "weapons and security considerations does not reflect this step properly".

France was clearly well pleased when it referred to the "flawless flow" and "transparency" of Molnar's chairing of the PrepCom. Saying "please don't interpret this as criticism", Ambassador Hubert de la Fortelle raised six points: that general and complete disarmament did "not have its due place as part of article VI"; that references to international stability and undiminished security had been omitted; that the references to negative security assurances (in paragraph 29) had not adequately reflected the reassertions of the 1995 assurances that had been made by four of the nuclear powers, including France; that the IAEA "deserved higher profile" (despite featuring positively in several paragraphs) and the full seriousness of the situation with regard to Iran had not been shown; that the peaceful uses of nuclear energy were under-represented; and, finally, that most work was from English texts! Though the principal thrust of the EU intervention was to make supportive noises about the summary commending Molnar for his "outstanding efforts", Greece also referred to the "common goals of nuclear disarmament

and general and complete disarmament", only just avoiding a French-style assertion of a link that had been severed by the 2000 NPT Review Conference final document.

The UK argued that there was a lack of balance in some regards, especially in the "small mention" of the NWS' security assurances and, referring to paragraphs 17 and 18, the lack of mention that four of the 5 NWS had declared moratoria on fissile material production. Ambassador David Boucher also said that the UK disagreed with the thrust in paragraph 10, which had repeated assertions about transparency and accountability from the 2002 report.

By contrast, on behalf of the **New Agenda Coalition**, Ambassador Tim Caughley of **New Zealand** looked forward, saying that it was essential to give sufficient time to issues that states parties wanted to move forward and see accelerated progress on. The New Agenda would be redoubling its efforts at future meetings, especially with regard to the implementation of the unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of nuclear arsenals, "a goal in itself, as well as being on the way towards complete and general disarmament". Egypt's Ambassador Na la Gabr strongly endorsed New Zealand's points and went on to focus specifically on the references to the Middle East (paras 22, 24 and 25), saying that the importance of a nuclear weapon free zone and, also, a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, should not be underestimated or tied to specific kinds of regional or political developments. **Germany** endorsed the view that future meetings needed to develop "a more focussed approach". **Brazil** considered that the work had by and large been successful, but wanted to see more on the problems of nuclear disarmament and threats faced by the NPT regime.

**Cuba**, the NPT's newest member, made a strong call for nuclear disarmament, saying that the 13 steps are "obligatory" and should be honoured by all states parties. Cuba also argued that export controls, though an important element, should not be applied for political reasons. **Uzbekistan** felt that there should have been stronger reference to the welcoming of progress on a Central Asian Nuclear Weapon Free Zone, as noted in para 23. **Malaysia**, on behalf of the **NAM**, welcomed the accession of Timor Leste to the NPT. Malaysia also hoped for continued progress on reporting and increased interaction in the review process. **Japan** specifically welcomed the participation of NGOs and appreciated Canada's work to enable better access for NGOs. **Syria** predictably ranted about Israel, objected to the reference to the roadmap in para 25, saying that "fulfilment of the NPT must not be conditional on anything else".

### Conclusion

This was a timid, overly managed meeting, in which NPT parties went through the motions of a review process rather than getting to grips with the real and serious proliferation challenges they face.

*Rebecca Johnson, May 9, 2003*



## An Indigenous Perspective

*Below is a transcript of the speech delivered by Kathy Wan Povi Sanchez of Tewa Women United during the NGO presentations to the NPT States Parties, April 30, 2003. All speeches can be found at:*

*[www.reachingcriticalwill.org/npt/NGOpres2003index.htm](http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/npt/NGOpres2003index.htm)*

Nuclear Genocide of Life Givers must stop: We are NOT disposable, nor are we invisible. We are Indigenous Peoples of this World.

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates and NGO colleagues, I bring you many blessings from our ancestral guardians who recognize the awesome power that is unleashed when the uniting of the male with the female perspectives are used as enhanced sources of inner strength for futuristic visioning.

In the preamble of the NPT it is stated, "Considering the devastation that would be visited upon all mankind by a major nuclear war..." Indigenous peoples make clarification and state that such devastation has already occurred. Whenever one death, one spirit is destroyed, all of mankind loses the promise of continued existence. I restate and reaffirm past views that have been expressed in prior presentations on the Indigenous perspective given by Jacqui Katoni and Richard Salvador.

While the NPT attempts to address the threat posed by nuclear weapons in the world while making provision for the peaceful use of nuclear technology in Article IV, it fails to recognize the disproportionate, accumulative and exponential impact of nuclear activities on Indigenous peoples. Nuclear industries continue to perpetrate ongoing and systemic invasion of Indigenous lands and culture.

In Indigenous communities the existence of uranium mines, nuclear waste dumps/ storage and nuclear test sites are a daily threat to life and continued existence of culture. As Indigenous communities living with this everyday threat we continue to question the notion of "peaceful use" in the NPT. As NPT states continue to struggle on "safeguarding" practices, the loss of life and irreversible destruction and desecration of entire nations goes without notice.

I am Wan Povi, an Indigenous Tewah T'owah from Poh Wohge Oweenge, San Ildefonso Pueblo in northern New Mexico, USA. I speak from the Indigenous perspective of one who shares a common boundary with a national defense laboratory engaged in active nuclear, radiological, biological and chemical research and development of weapons of massively destructive capabilities. This common boundary was carved out of the forced imposition of the Los Alamos National Laboratory upon our legendary ancestral and sacred homelands.

I am speaking of the 60-year legacy of this laboratory, the developer of the first atomic arsenal including atomic bombs and the "misnamed" depleted uranium weaponry used in the preemptive strike by the armed forces of the United States of America and their cohorts. Let me ask, can so-called Protectors of Peace who promote battling, warring and bombing be not consumed by the war mentality? The truth is you become what you practice and do.

It is known that eight nations have detonated nuclear weapons during the last 58 years. Five have used the lands of Indigenous peoples, the United States, Russia, France, the United Kingdom, and China. The Maori, the Marshall Islanders, Australian Aboriginals, the Bashir, the Tibetans, the Tartar and the First Peoples of the Americas are just some of the Indigenous nations that have been consistently contaminated with nuclear poison.

In the 2000 Review Conference all 187 NPT signatories agreed to 13 Practical Steps for the systemic and progressive disarmament of the world's nuclear weapons. These words will only have value when they are put into action. Let this become what you practice and do.

My cultural area of expertise is recognizing the spiritual aspects of energy, as life's fluidity, known to others as radiant love. The ionizing radioactive toxic poisoning is life's energy un-stabilized. The culture of nuclear violence began its existence as a cold, calculating parasitical entity consuming the spirit of the Life Givers. This is separation of the mind from the heart.

In terms of how has the nuclear chain industry effects the lives of our Pueblo people, I am the second generation who is witnessing the radioactive poisoning, the genocidal continuity of identity theft. My Aunties and Uncles were the manual laborers who served Oppenheimer and his fellow scientists by disposing of their sloppy manipulation of the nuclear waste, henceforth creating the legacy of toxic, radioactive waste. Our children and their children are now having skin diseases, cancer-related deaths of relatives, weaken immune systems allowing germs, viruses and other man-made radioactive material to invade our bodies and spirits. Soon ours and the whole genetic pools throughout

*continued on page 10*

the world will be lost. As we speak genetic cells are deforming, dysfunctioning, and sterility is setting in.

Why does one think it is permissible for the USA and its cohorts to forcefully use nuclear phallic symbols of earth penetrators and not think of it as the violent raping of our Earth Mother? Where is our sense of outrage and, especially, where is the love for our homelands? We need to reclaim homeland security as healthy boundaries and sacred spaces. It is not only about the people having a right to be safe but also about other peoples - countries being safe and healthy around delinquent playground, or nuclear world power bullies.

Seeing with the eyes of the heart, we weep and pray for the senseless loss of innocent lives, the unwarranted temporal war devastation of Mother Earth, the unnecessary injuries due to use of "depleted" uranium weaponry. The deliberate death and destruction, harming of others for one's own personal gain is appalling. Feel the pain and be moved to declare your worthiness to a non-nuclear, non-toxic world and promote non-violence and peace without threat of war, force or vengeance.

The Nuclear Weapons States knew from the beginning, in their own scientific findings, the whole process of radioactivity is long-term and deadly. It is horrifically destructive and an unnecessarily cruel method to rule the world just to gain control of global resources that belong to others. Make no more excuses or justifications or ignorance claim of not knowing, there is no "peaceful" or "safe use" of nuclear un-stable ionizing radioactive man-made materials. No matter how it is packaged for profit.

Indigenous peoples still believe the debate cannot treat disarmament and non-proliferation separately from the mining of uranium, the testing of weapons, nuclear research and the storage of toxic waste. We, Indigenous Mothers of our global families, call upon all nation states to be about purposeful living for our mutually assured world wellness.

We, Indigenous peoples of the world reiterate the call for measurable and verifiable cessation of scientific, technological, political, and corporate activities that result in a threat to the earth and her inhabitants. We call upon you, nation states, to adopt and enforce the termination of all activities of, or relating to, the development, production, and testing of nuclear technologies, including so called "peaceful" purposes. A healthy life is the inalienable birthright the NPT should uphold for all peoples of the world.

If our multitude of Indigenous languages were to be expressed here, we would use expressions in songs and rhythmic

patterns to say, "We Indigenous Elders of our earthly, global families, unite with the paradigm shift to a cultural consciousness of mutually assured wellness of our multiverse."

Today is the critical mass time for saying no more scientific bullying. No more use of terror tactics among the children of the world. We have the spirit, the radiant love, coming from all sacred elements to help seek the truth. We all have the ability to choose to unlearn, re-learn, and re-affirm our desire to be truly non-proliferating of un-stable ionizing radioactive sources of energies. NO separation from head to heart. We all have able wisdom, the love radiance of sharing, caring and nurturing to bring transformation of relationships. We have diverse cultural ways for seeking the truth to nurture and strengthen the energy bonding of the multiversal spirit of reciprocity, earth to people and peoples to peoples, in a manner harmonious with the cyclical nature of the breathe of life.

As was recognized in the Indigenous Peoples Presentation last year and at the 2000 NPT Review Conference, we continue to recommend with slight clarifications:

1) That at the 2004 Prep Com, NPT States Parties consider enabling a gender balanced delegation of Indigenous peoples to have direct input on matters before the NPT on crucial areas where their environment and livelihood have been severely devastated;

2) That NPT State Parties become directly informed on the issues of uranium mining, testing, experimenting, rehabilitation, and toxic waste storage affecting Indigenous communities through the establishment of relevant and formal reporting procedures and the provision of adequate resources to the task of a timely, independent parallel compilation of relevant information and findings;

3) That there is a commitment to the establishment of a holistic Indigenous Committee which reports to the NPT process officially and regularly on various States actions to address the issue of disadvantage arising from findings of such reporting relevant to Indigenous communities;

Let us commit to cultural valuing of peace by starting with self and saying thankfulness prayers, having good thought for relational sustainable living.

For all things of goodness, all elements seen and unseen, we give thanks. I give blessings to you from our ancestral past, the future generations and from the here and now of radiant love and may the breathe of life be extended to you all as you continue your deliberations. Go'od ddah.