



# NPT NEWS IN REVIEW

Civil society perspectives on the 2015 Review Conference of the  
nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), 27 April–22 May 2015



Reaching Critical Will

20 May 2015  
Vol. 13, No. 14

## IN THIS ISSUE

- 1 | Editorial
- 3 | News in brief
- 4 | Event:  
Disarmament  
verification
- 4 | Event: EU as a  
non-proliferation  
actor
- 5 | Mayors for Peace  
Appeal to the  
2015 NPT Review  
Conference
- 6 | Calendar of  
events

The *NPT News in Review* is a daily publication produced by the Reaching Critical Will programme of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom during meetings of NPT states parties.

See [reachingcriticalwill.org](http://reachingcriticalwill.org) for information, statements, papers, reports, archived *NPT News in Reviews*, and more from the NPT.

## EDITORIAL: UNSILENCING THE MAJORITY

Ray Acheson | *Reaching Critical Will of WILPF*

After three weeks of discussions, no consensus has been reached on any of the Main Committee texts. Some work will continue on some of the draft texts in informal meetings, but it is not clear to what end. The atmosphere in the plenary and in the room is not exactly characterised by states having made great progress and being close to agreement. The chairs of the Main Committees, at least II and III, are meeting in small groups to see if agreement can be reached in parallel meetings, but this approach makes it extremely difficult for small delegations from developing countries (and impossible for civil society) to participate.

The limitations on developing countries' participation in these meetings is already a serious issue. As shown by data collected by Article 36 for a recent paper on underrepresentation of low-income countries in nuclear disarmament forums, such countries are less likely to send representatives to multilateral meetings on nuclear disarmament, tend to field smaller delegations, and make fewer individual statements on average than richer countries.

Where they do make statements and proposals, these do not seem to be given equal weight as those from higher-income delegations. Sending people to and providing accommodation for them in New York City for a month-long conference is no easy feat for delegations from developing countries. With such expense, they should be granted every opportunity to engage fully and to be fully heard. When meetings break up into smaller, closed-door meetings, these delegations struggle even further to participate constructively.

This undermines both the NPT itself, but also multilateralism in general. And it prevents certain states from having the voice they have a right and responsibility to have in these discussions.

"Nuclear disarmament is a global concern: the interests of all countries must be

represented for any attempt to achieve the most equitable outcomes for populations worldwide," argues the Article 36 paper. As studies on the humanitarian impacts of nuclear weapons have shown, low-income countries could be more vulnerable to the negative impacts that any nuclear explosion would have on economies, the environment, and development objectives.

As reflected in *Reaching Critical Will's* 2013 publication *Unspeakable Suffering*, the use of nuclear weapons would undermine development and exacerbate poverty, hunger, and inequality. Interruptions to the supply of food and petroleum within the country where the nuclear explosion has occurred; disruptions to the global supply of goods and the impact that has on the local economy, the business sector, and the stock market; damage to infrastructure, lives, and livelihoods; and resulting forced or voluntary migration all have direct impacts on the levels of poverty and development in the affected country.

Global economic recession—a likely effect of the use of nuclear weapons—further undermines development objectives. Direct development aid is reduced due to perceived budget constraints in developed countries, while the recession also slows or ends economic growth in developing countries. The International Monetary Fund estimated that the global economy contracted by 0.6 percent in 2009 and that economies of developing countries contracted by 1.8 percent. The World Bank estimated that an additional 64 million people would fall into extreme poverty as a result of the global recession.

While a nuclear weapon explosion will not discriminate between rich and poor in its immediate impact, its long-term consequences will. Within countries, note the Guidelines for Crisis and the Millennium Development Goals, "the poorest populations are the most vulnerable to disasters as they are often left to settle on the riskiest

*continued on next page*

*Editorial, continued*

locations and have least access to measures of prevention, mitigation and preparedness." Disasters tend to exacerbate poverty because the poor are disproportionately affected by post-disaster inflation and by cuts in social spending. After a disaster, most governments reallocate funds from capital and social expenditure to cover expenses related to clean-up and reconstruction and most donor countries reallocate resources from development to emergency relief.

And amidst this reality of impacts, a handful of mostly wealthy countries wield nuclear weapons or include them in their security doctrines. They also dominate the discussions at NPT and other nuclear forums—except for the conferences on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons. At the three conferences, held over two days in Oslo, Nayarit, and Vienna, low-income countries were represented in force. Their voices were clearly heard in panel discussions and general debates, issuing a resounding call for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. And coming out of the Vienna meeting, many of them have endorsed what is now known as the Humanitarian Pledge for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons.

This Pledge now has over 90 endorsements from countries in Africa, Southeast Asia, the Middle East, Europe—and the whole of Latin America and the Caribbean. Its recognition of the complex and interrelated effects of a nuclear weapon detonation on health, environment, infrastructure, food security, climate, development, social cohesion, and the global economy leads to the firm commitment that nuclear weapons must never be used again, under any circumstances. To this end, those endorsing the Pledge commit themselves "to follow the imperative of human security for all" by filling the legal gap for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons.

This has been the dominant message from the majority of NPT states parties during this Review Conference. And it is this message that will be muffled by procedural decisions that decrease transparency and accessibility of meetings during the remainder of this Conference. But these countries will not be the silenced majority—they have found their voice through the 159-state joint statement on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons, and even more so, through the forward-looking Humanitarian Pledge. Regardless of what happens at this Review Conference, this is what Ireland described as "the new reality" and there is every reason to believe that it will lead to negotiations on a treaty to ban nuclear weapons. •



*nonukeart.org - Irie Hiroyuki*

## NPT NEWS IN REVIEW

20 MAY 2015 | Vol. 13, No. 14

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

777 UN Plaza, 6th Floor, New York, NY 10017  
ph. +1 212.682.1265  
email: [info@reachingcriticalwill.org](mailto:info@reachingcriticalwill.org)  
web: [www.reachingcriticalwill.org](http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org)

Editor: Ray Acheson

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



## NEWS IN BRIEF

Mia Ganderberger and Gabriella Irsten | *Reaching Critical Will of WILPF*

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

### Plenary

- Chair of Main Committee I, Ambassador Enrique Roman-Morey of Peru, reported that MCI had not been able to reach a consensus on the document before it. The MCI draft has been submitted to the President.
- Chair of Main Committee II, Ambassador Cristian Istrate of Romania, reported that MCII had not been able to reach a consensus on the documents before it. Both the SBII and the MCII drafts will be submitted as working papers under both Chair's respective capacities.
- Chair of Main Committee III, Ambassador David Stuart of Australia, reported that MCIII had not been able to reach a consensus on the documents before it. Both the SBIII and the MCIII drafts will be submitted as working papers to the conference.
- CELAC reiterated the declaration made by heads of state and government on nuclear disarmament from 4 February 2015.
- Cuba stressed that the outcome document should not go back on 2010 language and called for an outcome document to have added value and measurable and specific steps forward.
- Cuba also emphasised that none of the draft texts are negotiated documents.
- Brazil reiterated in light of further discussions on MCII issues that the AP is a voluntary measure.
- South Africa stressed that non-proliferation was never to be an end in itself, but a means to the bigger picture of ridding the world of nuclear weapons.
- The Chair scheduled the next check-in on the state of play for Wednesday at noon.
- The Drafting Committee will remain in stand-by-mode for the time being.
- The Committees will continue to meet informally to work on the texts.
- The meeting was suspended and delegations continued their work informally without civil society present. •



All available at [www.reachingcriticalwill.org](http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org)



## EVENT: DISARMAMENT VERIFICATION

Clare Conboy | Acronym Institute for Disarmament Diplomacy

On Friday, 15 May the Verification Research, Training and Information Centre (VERTIC) provided an update on their project on verifying nuclear disarmament. With speakers Andreas Persbo, VERTIC's Executive Director and Larry MacFaul, Senior Researcher, this was another all-male panel, which VERTIC ruefully acknowledged. It was chaired by one of VERTIC's female staff members, Legal Officer Sonja Drobysz.

The verification and monitoring project was developed to redress the imbalance of expertise in nuclear verification between the nuclear-armed and non-nuclear-armed member states of the IAEA. During the talk, Mr. MacFaul presented responses to a VERTIC questionnaire on attitudes towards multilateral nuclear verification and a potential IAEA role in verifying nuclear disarmament. While the survey is ongoing, the data gathered so far from an admittedly small group of respondents, coupled with earlier country statements and other documentation, indicates that there is support for the IAEA adding verification to its portfolio, with 80% in favour of the IAEA developing a long-term plan. He was followed by Mr. Persbo, who described the vir-

tual, simulated environment VERTIC is in the process of creating as a scenario-based tool to enable non-nuclear-armed states to participate and learn about nuclear disarmament verification.

The meeting was small, but elicited several interesting questions about the purpose and role of nuclear verification. In response, Mr. Persbo and Mr. MacFaul argued that the purpose of VERTIC's project was to build capacity and interest among the non-nuclear countries so that they would be prepared to monitor and, where required, contribute to the verification of future nuclear weapons treaties. As the IAEA's members include more of the nuclear-armed states than the NPT, as well as a large number of others, VERTIC's questionnaire helps to bring the debate about nuclear disarmament verification outside the NPT and empower non-nuclear-armed states to play a more active part in negotiations that require technical expertise, such as has been shown in the case of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and other nuclear and non-nuclear treaties. •

## EVENT: EU AS A NON-PROLIFERATION ACTOR

Susi Snyder | PAX

Organised by the Finnish Peace Union with the support of the International Peace Bureau, the discussion centered on what can be done inside Europe, or outside Europe, but as Europeans. One could say that if success happened in Europe, it could happen everywhere.

The session began with Xanthe Hall (IPPNW, Germany), Rebecca Johnson (Acronym Institute, UK), and Susi Snyder (PAX, Netherlands) giving a brief overview of the current situation in their respective countries. Hall described how Germany actually stepped back from the 2009 position calling for removal of US nuclear weapons and now makes Russia-US negotiated reductions a condition for withdrawal. Johnson discussed the recent outcomes of the UK general election. Even though the Tories won a majority of parliament and support a full replacement of their nuclear weapons capability, there are still openings for debate because of the increased information about costs, risks, and consequences. Snyder reflected that the Dutch public is petitioning for a national ban on nuclear weapons, and the parliament has just passed a motion calling on the government to participate fully, without prejudging outcomes, in any international negotiations on a nuclear weapons prohibition treaty.

Jacek Bylika, the Special Envoy for the European Union External Action Service on Non Proliferation

and Disarmament, described the many ways the EU is contributing substantively to non-proliferation and disarmament, including through significant financial contributions to IAEA, CTBTO, and some think tanks. He recognised that the EU does not have a lot of agreement among its members on nuclear weapons or nuclear energy, but argued there are still unifying philosophies including that the use of force, and war, are not a means of achieving or resolving problems.

The EU also supports the EU Consortium on Non Proliferation, which was talked about by Tariq Rauf (SIPRI). The Consortium is a collaborative effort of European think tanks working closely with the Representative of the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy on a range of security and non-proliferation issues.

After the presentations some comments from the floor included Harold Müller (Peace Research Institute Frankfurt), who noted that the EU hasn't been this divided on nuclear disarmament issues since 1990. Patricia Lewis (Chatham House) suggested that European states should consider developing a WMD free zone in the region. Recognising many are not quite there yet for nuclear weapons, declaring, documenting, and demonstrating commitment on WMD could be a confidence-building measure and support efforts in the region and abroad. •





## MAYORS FOR PEACE APPEAL TO THE 2015 NPT REVIEW CONFERENCE: VISIT HIROSHIMA AND NAGASAKI

Jacqueline Cabasso | Mayors for Peace North American Coordinator

Last Friday, 15 May, Mayors for Peace issued an Appeal to the President and all participating government representatives to the 2015 NPT Review Conference, urging reinstatement into the draft outcome document language stating, "In view of the 70th anniversary of the use of nuclear weapons, the Conference notes the proposal for world leaders, disarmament experts and youth to visit Hiroshima and Nagasaki to witness first-hand the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of the use of nuclear weapons and to hear the testimonies of the survivors (*Hibakusha*)."

This language had already been somewhat watered down from Japan's request in its 1 May statement to Main Committee I (MC I), that "this Conference in its outcome document... call on the world's political leaders and youth to visit Hiroshima and Nagasaki to witness the reality with their own eyes." The Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament Initiative (NPDI) likewise recommended in its 20 March joint working paper that, "The Conference invite the world's political leaders to visit Hiroshima and Nagasaki to witness the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons with their own eyes."

However, China and Republic of Korea have emphatically opposed the inclusion of the language proposed by Japan, with China declaring that Japan's intentions cannot be trusted because Japan committed its own atrocities during World War II, which it has not properly acknowledged. Australia, Austria, Chile, Marshall Islands, the Philippines, and Poland, made statements in support of reinstating the language. It is worth noting that China, ROK, the Marshall Islands, and the Philippines were all victims of Japanese aggression during World War II.

While the Japanese government's historically contradictory positions on many key nuclear disarmament efforts are self-evident at this Review Conference, Mayors for Peace and its member cities have independently for years been calling on world leaders and policy makers to visit Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In 2010, the US Conference of Mayors adopted a resolution "encourag[ing] President Obama, members of the Cabinet and Congress to visit Hiroshima and Nagasaki at the earliest possible date." In its 15 May Appeal to the NPT, Mayors for Peace explains the significance of visiting Hiroshima and Nagasaki:

"Our persistent calls for visits to atomic bombed cities and for hearing of survivors' testimonies have been made in full recognition of the heavy responsibility of city mayors to protect the safety and welfare of their citizens.... 70 years after the actual use of nuclear weap-

ons, it is high time that all the leaders of the world join hands to implement the NPT Article VI obligation to negotiate in good faith nuclear disarmament.

Visits to Hiroshima and Nagasaki have much to offer in assisting these leaders to fulfill that obligation. It is through such visits that leaders can inscribe into their hearts the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of the use of nuclear weapons. Personal visits can also strengthen their unshakable determination to work together to abolish nuclear weapons. It is crucially important for them to visit these atomic bombed cities and to hear the testimonies of *hibakusha* of their first-hand experience in confronting the humanitarian catastrophe of nuclear warfare. It is only through such visits that leaders can learn the full meaning of the earnest appeal of the *hibakusha* that 'no one else shall ever again suffer as we have.'

Anticipating China's objection, the Mayors for Peace Appeal concludes: "And let us be crystal clear—we have no intention whatsoever to justify any countries' war-time records in presenting this earnest appeal."

The Appeal was signed by Mayor Kazumi Matsui, President of Mayors for Peace, Nagasaki Mayor Tomihisa Taue, a Vice-President, and 22 Vice-Presidents and mayors of Lead Cities in as many countries, on five continents. •



International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons

# NPT NEWS IN REVIEW

## CALENDAR OF EVENTS

When	What	Where	Who
10:00-13:00	Plenary	Trusteeship	
10:00-13:00	Drafting Committee	ECOSOC	
13:15-14:30	Where are we and where do we need to go now?	Conference Room C Conference Building	Global Security Institute
13:15-14:30	NPT Action Plan 2010	Conference Room D Conference Building	Russian Federation
15:00 -18:00	Plenary	Trusteeship	
15:00 -18:00	Drafting Committee	ECOSOC	

