



NPT NEWS IN REVIEW

Civil society perspectives on the 2017 nuclear Non-Proliferation
Treaty Preparatory Committee 2–12 May 2017



Reaching Critical Will

12 May 2017
Vol. 14, No. 6

- 1 | **Editorial:**
**Divergence
doesn't preclude
progress**
- 2 | **Side event:**
**Achieving the
entry into force
of the CTBT**
- 3 | **News in brief**

The *NPT News in Review* is produced by the Reaching Critical Will programme of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF).

Editor: Ray Acheson
info@reachingcriticalwill.org

The views expressed in this publication are not necessarily those of WILPF or Reaching Critical Will.

See reachingcriticalwill.org for information, statements, papers, reports, archived *NPT News in Reviews*, and more from the NPT.

DIVERGENCE DOESN'T PRECLUDE PROGRESS

Ray Acheson | *Reaching Critical Will, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom*

The final day of the 2017 Preparatory Committee heard much praise for the Chair, Ambassador Henk Cor Van der Kwast of the Netherlands, but also a number of critiques of his factual summary, produced "on his own authority". The summary, which has the status of a working paper rather than an agreed outcome of the meeting, was seen by most states taking the floor as a valiant if flawed attempt to present a balanced view of perspectives aired during this meeting. Given the broad divergence of views on several issues—including the nuclear ban treaty, the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons, the Middle East, increasingly robust safeguards and non-proliferation obligations, etc.—it was clear from the outset that no one would be fully satisfied with the summary. Despite this, the summary at least covers the range of issues raised during this PrepCom.

However, even though this is not a negotiated or agreed text, it was still presented as a reflection of perspectives and in this there are a few key ways in which it is lacking. The New Agenda Coalition pointed out that the nuclear ban treaty only warranted two sentences on paragraph 49 of the report. Given that 132 states are participating in this process, and the broad support it received during the PrepCom deliberations, the NAC and several other delegations found this insufficient. The Austrian delegation also noted that while the reference in paragraph 49 only discusses the prohibition treaty's benefits for the NPT, this treaty "will also contribute to more security for all," which deserves a mention, too. In broader terms, the references to the "security benefits" of nuclear weapons espoused by some delegations that are reflected in the Chair's summary "serves as a stimulus for further proliferation, as more and more states might wish to get hold of these weapons," warned Austria.

France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States reiterated their opposition to the nuclear weapon ban treaty, with most complaining about the minimalist

reference to it in the Chair's summary. Despite Russia's urge for negotiating states to "do no harm" to the NPT, so far, the nuclear weapon ban treaty has not destroyed NPT or its review process. Given that this was the predominant concern of the nuclear-armed states and their nuclear-supportive allies in the lead-up to the first preparatory committee, it seems fair to assume that their other predictions and anxieties about the prohibition treaty may be equally unfounded. What was made clear during this meeting is that the vast majority of NPT states parties—more than two-thirds—are actively and constructively participating in negotiations to outlaw nuclear weapons as a measure to facilitate implementation of the NPT, create conditions for nuclear disarmament, increase security for all states and people, and fill an essential moral and legal gap.

Other delegations expressed other concerns with the Chair's summary, which are reflected in the "news in brief" section of this publication. But the summary has some progressive elements, too—one of which relates to increasing the participation of women in the work of the NPT. This is noted both as a recommendation for strengthening the review process in paragraph 135, and in more depth in paragraph 7. This latter paragraph reflects that states parties "emphasized the importance of promoting the equal, full and effective participation of both women and men in the process of nuclear non-proliferation, nuclear disarmament and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy." It even draws out research brought to the Preparatory Committee by Ireland showing that women's participation in NPT meetings is lower than in other multilateral forums, and notes that states parties "were encouraged, in accordance with their commitments under United Nations Security Council resolution 1325, actively to support participation of female delegates in their own NPT delegations and through support for sponsorship programs."

This language was welcomed by the delegations of Canada, Ireland, and Thai-

continued on next page

Editorial, continued

land—the last of which also reiterated the need to incorporate gender perspectives on nuclear disarmament in the work of the NPT, not just increasing the participation of women. Together with recognizing the disproportionate gendered impacts of nuclear weapons and increasing gender diversity on delegations, incorporating a gender analysis and awareness into our work is imperative to address one of the most central issues impeding nuclear disarmament.

The association of masculinity with militarism, particularly in the context of nuclear weapons, is one piece of the puzzle impeding disarmament and the pursuit of demilitarised security arrangements. The association of weapons and war as a symbol of masculine strength makes it harder to open up discussions about disarmament. One current example is that proponents of abolishing nuclear weapons (or even of discussing humanitarian impacts of nuclear weapons) are put down as unrealistic and irrational and emotional.

This is classic patriarchy. It links caring about humanitarian concerns to being weak and not relevant for the job that “real men” have to do to “protect” their coun-

tries. It not only suggests that caring about the use of nuclear weapons is spineless and silly, but also makes the pursuit of disarmament out to be an unrealistic, irrational, and even “emotional” objective.

The challenges of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation are complex, dynamic, and intertwined. But what has been clear throughout this Preparatory Committee is that the majority of states want to make progress. They want to prohibit nuclear weapons, they want the nuclear-armed states to eliminate their arsenals, and they want to cooperate with one another to make the world safer and more secure for all. The current imbalance, rooted in patriarchy and militarism, is intolerable. The fact that 132 states have started a process without the blessing of the “powers that be” is a remarkable development that will have reverberating effects on the NPT throughout this review cycle—for the betterment of this Treaty and the world. What can a group of committed states, determined to respect the rule of law and protect humankind and our shared planet, do for us moving forward? The ban is only the beginning. •

SIDE EVENT: ACHIEVING THE ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE CTBT

Vienna Centre for Disarmament and Non-Proliferation

On 10 May 2017, the VCDNP, the Permanent Mission of Japan and the Permanent Mission of Kazakhstan held a high-level panel discussion entitled “Achieving the Entry into Force of the CTBT.” The five panelists were: Ambassador Mitsuru Kitano, Permanent Representative of Japan; Ambassador Kairat Sarybay, Permanent Representative of Kazakhstan; Mr. Genxin Li, CTBTO Director of Legal and External Relations; Ms. Angela Kane, VCDNP Senior Fellow; and Lord Desmond Browne, Chair of the European Leadership Network. The discussion was moderated by Ms. Laura Rockwood, VCDNP Executive Director, and followed by a question and answer period.

This was one of the last events in which Ambassador Kitano and Ambassador Sarybay took part as co coordinators of the CTBT Article XIV Conferences, aimed at facilitating the entry into force of the treaty, before the role is taken up by to the governments of Belgium and Iraq. Both Ambassadors stated that their governments will continue to provide tangible support to this cause given their nuclear legacies. They encouraged the next co-coordinators to be imaginative in coming up with new ideas to promote the CTBT.

The panel discussion followed a closed meeting which took place at the VCDNP before the public

event. Daryl G. Kimball, Executive Director of the Arms Control Association, and Gaukhar Mukhatzhanova of the VCDNP presented summaries of the two sessions in the morning meeting. The first discussion highlighted the need to understand specific reasons for the remaining Annex II States to stay outside the CTBT. The second session, devoted to public outreach, emphasized the importance of disarmament and non-proliferation education and the need to involve the youth in both advocacy and analytical work on nuclear weapons issues .

Mr. Genxin Li described the work of the CTBTO’s International Monitoring System and International Data Centre. Ms. Kane criticized the non-ratifying Article XIV states for waiting for each other to act, and pointed out that China, which lately appears more willing to act independently, might be the one to take the first step and ratify the CTBT before the United States. Lord Browne expressed his concern about the current generation of politicians who have little or no knowledge about nuclear weapons.

During the question and answer period, the activities of the CTBTO Youth Group were highlighted along with the need for the states parties to the CTBT to take more concrete action in promoting the treaty’s entry into force. •



NEWS IN BRIEF

Allison Pytlak | *Reaching Critical Will of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom*

The news in brief is not a comprehensive overview of all positions or statements. It highlights new or particularly salient recommendations or comments from final discussions, including comments on the Chair's draft summary. Statements are available at www.reachingcriticalwill.org.

Draft report

- The draft report of the Preparatory Committee was adopted, noting that two additional working papers will be added to the list under paragraph 21. The title of working paper 38 will be amended to "Gender, development and nuclear weapons".
- The two decisions contained in the draft report under paragraph 20 were also passed, requesting an estimate for the costs of the Review Conference to be prepared by the Secretary for the next Prep-Com, and nominating the provisional Secretary-General of the 2020 Review Conference.
- The chair clarified that the draft Chair's factual summary will be included in the list of working papers contained in the report, and that it represents his summary of the session and not the agreed views of states parties.

Responses to the summary and closing remarks

- All states that spoke congratulated the Chair for his work and noted that while not perfect, the summary is delivered in a personal context; many called it balanced.
- Venezuela, on behalf of NAM, expressed appreciation for the time that the chair took to meet with the Group in advance.
- Ambassador Van der Kwast thanked everyone for their participation, noting the clear political will to strengthen the NPT and that with "great power comes great responsibility".

Middle East

- The US encouraged states in the Middle East to seek progress on the goal of a WMD-free zone, but warned against holding the NPT hostage to specific interests.
- Iran complained that the concern expressed by some states—including large blocs like NAM—relating to Israel's non-participation in the 2012 conference and references to decisions about Israeli accession and putting its facilities under IAEA safeguards.
- Syria said that the weapons build-up in Israel is of concern to some states parties not found in the summary, and that concerns about Syria's nuclear programme are reflected but not Israel's strike on Syrian facilities.

- Egypt felt the draft report did not express the full range of views of states parties in relation to the failure of the 2015 Review Conference, which in Egypt's view is due to a lack of political will to implement the 1995 resolution on the Middle East.
- Algeria felt the summary did not sufficiently note the broad support for implementing the 1995 resolution on the Middle East.
- Russia said that the responsibility is on all three co-sponsors of this resolution.
- Iraq said that the subject of implementing the 2010 action plan has not enjoyed the right importance and it hopes that the issue of a WMD-free zone in the Middle East will achieve notable progress as soon as possible. Russia stated similar views on the importance of progress and this and its own contributions towards this goal.

Prohibition treaty

- Indonesia noted that multilateral discussions on nuclear disarmament have been stalled in the CD for a very long time and hence Indonesia is supporting the prohibition treaty negotiations.
- Ecuador said the paragraphs 49 and 50 put forward a picture it disagrees with, noting that two-thirds of NPT states parties strongly support and participate in the prohibition treaty negotiations. The language in this paragraph makes the negotiations sound like a "marginal proposal".
- Chile, Cuba, Iran, Ireland New Zealand and South Africa made a similar point. Austria added that the benefits of the prohibition treaty to the NPT deserve particular mention; it is not meant as an end, but as a trigger for the elaboration of additional measures.
- Nigeria noted that it and other like-minded states have called on all states to join the prohibition treaty negotiations, but this is not mentioned, even though those negotiations are within the framework of the UN and aim to strengthen the NPT.
- Algeria felt the treatment of the prohibition and calls for robust participation of nuclear-armed states was not well represented.
- The US reiterated the nuclear ban will not eliminate a single nuclear warhead.
- France reiterated is not in favour of the prohibition treaty process and is not participating in it.
- Russia called on the participants of the next round of negotiations to remember their responsibility for the future of the NPT and the importance of not undermining its vitality and sustainability.

continued on next page



News in brief, continued

- UK said it has been explicit in saying that an international ban on nuclear weapons will not advance the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons, nor improve the international security environment or increase trust or transparency.

Humanitarian impacts of nuclear weapons

- Nigeria and the Holy See appreciated the reflection in paragraph 14 regarding the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons.
- Guatemala and Iraq felt that there could have been a stronger reference given that so many delegations spoke to this point.
- The New Agenda Coalition suggested including the full name of the three conferences that took place on this subject.
- Ecuador said it is not clear from how paragraph 15 is written that a large number of countries and regional groups expressed strong support that the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons should be discussed in the context of the NPT. South Africa reiterated this.

Gender

- Canada welcomed the discussion in this meeting about women's participation in nuclear disarmament and reminded states of their commitments under UN Security Resolution 1325.
- Ireland, on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition, welcomed the references to the gendered impact of nuclear weapons and women's participation contained in paragraph 7.
- Thailand supported the idea of increasing women's participation in the work of the PrepCom and appreciated the contributions offered by the Irish working paper on gender, development, and nuclear disarmament.

Universalisation

- Nigeria and South Africa would have liked for South Sudan to not be included in the same paragraph as India, Pakistan, and Israel regarding universalization, as their circumstances are different than those three.
- Nigeria said that in cooperation with other African states it will commence a discussion with South Sudan about accession to the NPT and the Treaty of Pelindaba.

Methods of work

- Argentina, Canada, Germany, Indonesia, and Poland, among others, are pleased at the general support for better information sharing and transition between the chairs of PrepComs, and the upcoming RevCon.

Other

- The US said that once its nuclear posture review is complete more clear positions will be put forward but in the interim it has submitted a working paper on the subject of the "common interests" of all NPT states parties.
- Brazil, Ecuador, and Guatemala felt that that paragraph 27 reflecting the "welcoming of increased transparency" by non-nuclear-armed states is not accurate.
- The NAC submitted working paper with amendments it would like to see to the Chair's summary.
- Indonesia would have liked a better recognition of the roles and abilities of the IAEA in verification.
- Brazil and Egypt said that it is crucial to mention stockpiles of fissile materials in the relevant paragraphs.
- Brazil noted that paragraph 53 omits reference to the 2018 High Level Conference on Nuclear Disarmament.
- Brazil said that the language in paragraph 73 on State-level Concept doesn't reflect the reality of discussions at the IAEA on this over the last several years and suggested using language from conference resolutions instead.
- Brazil expressed concern that the wording of several paragraphs implied conditionalities, citing paragraphs 58, 59, 77, and 112.
- Guatemala said that the last sentence of paragraph 13 is imprecise, and not their position. Chile felt that this paragraph implies conditionalities.
- China felt that its support, and that of other delegations over the course of the PrepCom for the CD as the sole appropriate forum to negotiate an FMCT, was not accurately reflected in the Summary.
- Chile disassociated itself with paragraph 36, stating that it doesn't welcome a moratorium on testing, which is why it ratified the CTBT, a legally binding prohibition, many years ago.
- Austria challenged the view that nuclear weapons contribute to stability and is of the view that the alleged security benefits are a stimulus for further proliferation.
- Ukraine reiterated its position, that has been echoed by many others, about Russia's breach of the Budapest Memorandum.
- Australia and Iraq welcomed the clear language in the Summary about the issue of DPRK. France is pleased about its work with the Republic of Korea on a Joint Statement on this subject. •