



# NPT NEWS IN REVIEW

Civil society perspectives on the 2013 nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty Preparatory Committee 22 April–3 May 2013



Reaching Critical Will

23 April 2013  
Vol. 11, No. 2

## IN THIS ISSUE

- 1 | Editorial
- 2 | NPDI matters?
- 4 | Event report:  
Scrapping  
Trident
- 5 | Good faith
- 6 | Guided by the  
blind
- 7 | Event report:  
*Nuclear  
Weapons: The  
State of Play*
- 8 | Event report:  
Beyond IHL
- 9 | Event report:  
Nuclear  
weapons in  
Europe
- 10 | News in Brief
- 12 | Calendar of  
events

The NPT News in Review is a daily publication produced by the Reaching Critical Will project 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.

## The responsibility for achieving a world free of nuclear weapons

Beatrice Fihn | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

“Disarmament is not an obligation limited to the five NPT nuclear-weapon states,” said the US delegation in its opening statement. The Russian delegation highlighted that article VI applies to all countries, not only nuclear possessing states.

It is not always that we agree with nuclear possessing governments, but these comments we support wholeheartedly.

Nuclear weapons are a global concern, as any use would cause a catastrophic impact that could spread beyond borders and affect future generations. Regardless to which governments the weapons belong, the existence of nuclear weapons is a threat against our common security. People around the world will suffer the consequences, independent of where we live, under whatever security arrangement we operate, or to which nuclear weapon free zone our governments adhere.

This is the reason we are here. We are at the NPT PrepCom because it is universally recognized that nuclear weapons are bad and they should not be used.

And after listening to the first day of opening statements, it is clear that the US and Russia are right: the international community absolutely must not leave the responsibility of disarmament only to nuclear possessing countries.

We cannot put the security of people around the world in the hands of governments that say such things as, “We have committed not to develop new nuclear warheads or pursue new military missions for nuclear weapons” yet simultaneously commit to spend billions on upgrading those weapons to make them more “reliable and accurate”.

Neither should we leave the responsibility of nuclear disarmament to governments that say the best way of protecting themselves against threats is through retaining a nuclear weapons capability. As the South African delegation pointed out, the continued retention of nuclear weapons “serves as a catalyst for further proliferation, as

illustrated by the recent deplorable nuclear weapons test conducted by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK).”

And we should not sit by and wait for progress from a group of countries that are spending four years on a “P5 Working Group on the Glossary of Definitions for Key Nuclear Terms”.

This isn't exactly progress on disarmament.

This is why many non-nuclear weapon states drew attention to the slow progress on nuclear disarmament during the first day. Switzerland highlighted that several independent reports from civil society actors (such as Reaching Critical Will's 2010 NPT Action Plan monitoring report), conclude that while progress on non-proliferation and nuclear energy have been recorded, there's “practically no progress whatever in the area of nuclear disarmament.” South Africa pointed out that most states parties to the NPT remain very concerned about the lack of urgency and seriousness of nuclear disarmament approaches.

It is therefore time for non-nuclear weapon states to step up and take responsibility, and to help create the conditions for nuclear disarmament. Because just as the US and Russia pointed out, all states must take the lead and make further progress on the way towards elimination of nuclear weapons.

Concern about the humanitarian and environmental impacts of nuclear weapons has grown since the 2010 NPT Review Conference. The majority of statements during the opening day of this PrepCom referenced to this topic and the recent conference in Oslo. By repeatedly highlighting how unacceptable nuclear weapons are, non-nuclear weapon states have a concrete way of actually creating conditions for a world without them. It is a way for non-nuclear weapon states to take responsibility for disarmament and implement article VI, especially at a time when progress in existing disarmament fora remains deadlocked.

*continued on next page*

## NPDI matters?

Susi Snyder | IKV Pax Christi

The Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative (NPDI) will hold a side event today at 13.15 in the Assembly Hall. The group of ten countries has submitted several working papers to this PrepCom and some to last year as well. The model reporting form, submitted last year, is something of interest and should be used as by the NPDI states themselves to report to the PrepCom. The working papers submitted this year, however, are woefully inadequate.

Instead of examining each of the four documents, I will focus on two areas that the NPDI can have a significant impact, if they choose to do so. In NPT/CONF.2015/PC.II/WP.4, on the reduced role of nuclear weapons, NPDI only calls on the nuclear weapon states. It does not address the role nuclear weapons play in the security strategies of seven of the ten NPDI members. The basic recommendation seems to be for the rest of the nuclear weapon states to adopt the US Nuclear Posture Review language from 2010, just as NATO has done. NPDI is correct in saying that “concrete efforts must be made so that the possible use of nuclear weapons becomes even more remote than it is now”. Fortunately, NPDI members can, themselves, make concrete efforts in this regard by choosing themselves not to remain under the US nuclear umbrella—they do not need to wait for further quantitative reductions. This is something that Australia, Canada, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Poland, and Turkey can do right away to reduce the likelihood that nuclear weapons will be ever used again.

### Editorial, continued

Just as Ambassador Higgie of New Zealand noted, the discussion that the Oslo conference started is an opportunity “to advance our collective nuclear disarmament responsibility”.

Recognizing that any use of nuclear weapons would have unacceptable humanitarian impact and that no current capacity exists to provide any humanitarian assistance in such a case is not a controversial step forward, but it does open up space for serious deliberation on how to most efficiently prevent such harm.

After so many years of stalemate, the overwhelming majority of the world’s governments, in particular of those countries without nuclear weapons, must take responsibility for initiating progressive change and take the lead to reach our common goal, a world free of nuclear weapons. •

The second working paper to take note of is WP.3, on non-strategic nuclear weapons. NPDI starts off on the right track, recognizing that non strategic nuclear weapons are “typically smaller and more easily transported” making them more susceptible to theft by madmen or terrorists. NPDI goes on to note the positive initiative between NATO and the Russian Federation to build confidence and transparency about each others’ non-strategic nuclear arsenals. NPDI’s suggestion that both the non-strategic and strategic arsenals can be reduced through “unilateral, bilateral, regional and multilateral measures” also opens a door for reductions as a confidence-building measure. Reductions, or relocations (easily verified through existing national satellite technology or crowd-sourcing), can be taken without delay. Given yesterday’s article in the Guardian UK, highlighting the escalating costs of planned B-61 modernization in the US (these are the gravity bombs forward deployed in three of the NPDI countries), further reducing these weapons and saving an expected \$10 billion. That NPDI says they “therefore call for a fresh look at the deployment of non-strategic nuclear weapons” is a welcome contribution to these ongoing discussions, something that the NPDI members themselves can, and should, do something about.

In today’s plenary, and during side events, NPDI will present itself and its proposals. This group of ten states has some interesting and potentially useful proposals, and if the actions of the seven states under nuclear umbrellas were as strong as the words of the ten, then one could easily agree that NPDI matters. •

## NPT NEWS IN REVIEW

23 April 2013 | Vol. 11, No. 2

Reaching Critical Will  
A programme of the Women’s International  
League for Peace and Freedom

web: [www.reachingcriticalwill.org](http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org)  
email: [info@reachingcriticalwill.org](mailto:info@reachingcriticalwill.org)

Editors: Ray Acheson and Beatrice Fihn

*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.*





**IPFM**  
INTERNATIONAL PANEL  
ON FISSILE MATERIALS

## ***Increasing Transparency of Nuclear-warhead and Fissile-material Stocks as a Step toward Disarmament***

A Briefing by the International Panel on Fissile Materials (IPFM)

Speakers: Zia Mian  
Pavel Podvig  
Frank von Hippel

*The IPFM will present proposals for how nuclear weapon states could make progress towards meeting their obligations under the “Action Plan on Nuclear Disarmament” agreed in the 2010 nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference by increasing the transparency of their nuclear-warhead and fissile-material stocks.*

**Wednesday, May 24, 3:30–5:30 p.m.  
Room VI, Palais des Nations, United Nations, Geneva**



**Side event report: Scrapping Trident***Sofia Tuvestad | WILPF Sweden*

On the panel of this side event were Jeremy Corbyn, Labour MP and Chair of Parliamentary CND in the Westminster Parliament, Sir Nick Harvey, Liberal Democrat MP and former Defence Minister, Dr Rebecca Johnson, Co-Chair of the International Campaign for the Abolition of Nuclear Weapons (ICAN), as well as Bill Kidd, Scottish National Party MP and Co-Convenor of Nuclear Disarmament group in the Scottish Parliament. Dr Kate Hudson, General Secretary for the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND), chaired the panel.

As the international debate on nuclear disarmament has come to a crossroads, so have the future of the UK submarine-based Trident nuclear weapons system. The decision on whether Trident should be renewed will be made around 2016 and the upcoming parliamentary vote calls for substantial and transparent discussions. The panellists lined up a number of arguments for why the UK should decide on nuclear disarmament, rather than modernizing a nuclear arsenal that is neither needed nor wanted. As pointed out in the new CND publication “Scrapping Trident: Political Perspectives on Disarmament from the UK,” a 2007 poll showed 72% of UK citizens opposed the UK government’s plan on constructing new submarines for the Trident system.

The UK is one of five states within the NPT that have chosen to not only keep their nuclear weapons, but also make plans for their modernization, in contradiction with article VI of the Treaty. Regrettably, the national nuclear debate that is currently developing around the up-coming Trident decision seems to reflect this position, said Rebecca Johnson. She argued there is an urgent need for a global disarmament perspective on the Trident issue.

The debate on Trident should recognise that there is a current international crisis related to nuclear weapons while the negotiations within the NPT fail to bring about sufficient disarmament efforts. Times of crisis are also times of possibilities, said Rebecca Johnson, as she argued that we are indeed facing a historic momentum for disarmament. Recognising the lack of progress within the NPT, as well the unacceptable humanitarian consequences if nuclear weapons were used again, the only feasible solution is a comprehensive, non-discriminatory, ban treaty on these weapons that would lead to their complete elimination. It is important that people see this as an historic potential for a change in the UK policy, said Bill Kidd.

Sir Nick Harvey addressed several of the argu-

ments usually used to defend nuclear weapons possessions. In pointing out the halting logic of keeping a nuclear deterrent as if we were still living under the threat of the Cold War, Sir Harvey poignantly noted that the UK seems to be “waving its nuclear deterrent at nobody in particular”. He argued that there is no strong argument to be made for why the UK should need such deterrent today. In addition to this, he questioned the idea that having a nuclear arsenal is what gives the UK influence to effect decision-making on international peace and security. He highlighted that there are far better ways for the UK to contribute and protect its global interests.

The panel also addressed the budgetary dimension of the Trident debate. As referred to by the CND in “Scrapping Trident,” spending on submarine and deterrent procurement is due to rise from around £1.1 billion in 2012/13 to around £2.4 billion in 2021/22 according to the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI). As WILPF and other civil society organisations have argued, the UK government should redirect funding from military spending to social and welfare investments—a reprioritizing that is even more urgent with the current financial crisis and subsequent budget cuts.

In addition to drawing on humanitarian, security related, and budgetary arguments for why the UK should choose disarmament over renewal, the panel through Bill Kidd also raised the question of where a new system of submarines would be based. Kidd pointed to the possible scenario of Scottish independence after the 2014 referendum, as experts say the UK government would face great difficulties replacing the Trident system to a new location.

Jeremy Corbyn rightly pointed out that if the NPT fails to achieve its goals of eliminating nuclear weapons, we risk moving into a more dangerous world with more nuclear weapons states. He expressed regret over the fact that “some states” did not participate in the conference on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons hosted by the Norwegian government in Oslo early March this year.

It is indeed regrettable that the five nuclear armed states in the NPT decided not to attend the Oslo conference, stating it would be a “distraction” of current disarmament efforts. However, as civil society as well as several states has concluded, there is nonetheless a great potential of the humanitarian perspective to “distract” states away from the current stalemate and redirect the debate towards a revived agenda for total and global elimination of nuclear weapons. •





## Good faith: essential to nuclear disarmament and human survival

Rick Wayman | Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

A new paper by Judge Christopher G. Weeramantry looks deeply at the concept of good faith, an extremely important concept included in Article VI of the NPT and a central principle of international law. Judge Weeramantry, who served as Vice President of the International Court of Justice when it ruled on the illegality of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons in 1996, is uniquely qualified to address this topic.

The Court reinforced the importance of good faith in 1996 when it pronounced: “There exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.”

According to Weeramantry, “No higher legal pronouncement on a question of international law is possible than the unanimous opinion of the world’s highest court. No greater issue can come to a court than one involving the survival of humanity. No more all-embracing and respected concept exists in international law than the concept of good faith. The obligation spelled out by the Court straddled all these aspects of fundamental importance.”

Modernization of nuclear weapons and delivery systems, comprehensively detailed in Reaching Critical Will’s report *Still Assuring Destruction Forever*, brings front and center the concept of good faith. Weeramantry does not mince words when he identi-

fies these modernization programs as breach of good faith. He asks readers to consider whether “there has been not merely a violation of good faith but an actual manifestation of bad faith in this matter.”

This breach of good faith through modernization programs is a shameful endless circle, with one country’s actions prompting the other nuclear powers to do likewise, escalating the level of departures from the duty of good faith. Such action has also, according to Weeramantry, prompted non-nuclear powers to seek to acquire nuclear weapons.

In the context of the NPT, good faith would start with an immediate halt to the modernization of nuclear weapons and delivery systems. Good faith efforts must continue until the obligation of nuclear disarmament is achieved. As Judge Weeramantry concludes, “There can be no basis for the disregard or incomplete performance of an obligation so deeply ingrained in international law, so clearly undertaken by the nuclear powers, so carefully pronounced by the International Court of Justice and so definitely determining whether humanity will flourish or perish.”

*The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation’s briefing paper by Judge Weeramantry, Good Faith: Essential to Nuclear Disarmament and Human Survival, is available on the information table in the NGO Room at the Palais des Nations, and online at [www.wagingpeace.org/goto/goodfaith](http://www.wagingpeace.org/goto/goodfaith).*

## CIVIL SOCIETY PRESENTATIONS TO THE NPT PREPCOM

**WEDNESDAY, 24 APRIL 2013**  
**10:00-13:00 | ASSEMBLY HALL**

### Keynote speaker

Ward Wilson, author of *Five Myths about Nuclear Weapons*

### Panel event featuring:

Tim Wright, ICAN Australia (moderator)  
Beatrice Fihn, Reaching Critical Will of WILPF  
Cesar Jaramillo, Project Ploughshares  
Robert Mtonga, IPPNW Zambia  
Katherine Prizeman, Global Action to Prevent War

### Statements from

*Hibakusha*, Youth Delegates, Parliamentarian, and Mayors



**Guided by the blind***Tarja Cronberg | Member of European Parliament*

The key power brokers in the global disarmament process are states that already have nuclear weapons. Would it be better if states that do not possess nuclear weapons would take the lead in the process towards non-proliferation and disarmament?

Following the realisation that nuclear weapons proliferated excessively in the world, the states that had already built nuclear weapons assumed the role of 'gatekeepers' with an aim to limit other states' access to military nuclear technology. According to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), Russia, China, the US, France and United Kingdom (the 'Big Five'), are allowed to possess of nuclear weapons, although they are required by the treaty to negotiate their elimination in good faith. These states are also permanent members of the UN Security Council, and they decide on sanctions against countries developing or potentially aspiring to develop nuclear weapons, such as the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) or Iran. Together with Germany, these countries also form the exclusive P5+1 club of negotiators on Iran's nuclear programme.

The Big Five pledged to disarm in line with the goals of the NPT but in reality they maintain their right to possess nuclear weapons. In 2012, the UN General Assembly decided to establish a working group "to find proposals to take forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations for the achievement and maintenance of a world without nuclear weapons". Four countries voted against this course of action: the US, United Kingdom, France, and Russia. The first three countries also declared - in advance - that they would not accept any actions the group may propose. The

permanent five member states are also absent from the high profile inter-governmental conference, which the Norwegian government organised in March.

There appears to be a consensus that the NPT is both unjust and arbitrary. Legally, only the five countries that had detonated a nuclear bomb or device before 1967 are allowed to possess nuclear weapons. The world has changed and it is about time to review the premises of the treaty, equally because nuclear technology is increasingly easy to access and because some of the current conflicts are related to new countries aspiring to become nuclear weapon states. If the international community decides to continue to rely on the NPT, we should think of ways to make the NPT more credible and to establish the same rules for all.

What would happen if the leading actors on non-proliferation were non-nuclear weapon states, for example Japan, Norway, Mexico, or Egypt, rather than the Big Five? One could also add to this list the countries that voluntarily relinquished their nuclear weapons or weapon programmes, such as Brazil, Sweden, and South Africa. Would their impact on global nuclear disarmament be any different?

In my view, a way to approach this question would be to empower the states without nuclear weapons to take the lead in the international non-proliferation and disarmament processes. The non-nuclear states should have the possibility to voice their views and opinions in the UN Security Council. When it comes to nuclear proliferation they could be the only ones to vote and they should also be involved in negotiations with Iran and DPRK. •

Education is key to changing perspectives about nuclear weapons and encouraging people to join us in working for a world free of nuclear weapons. In this spirit, the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation is convening a panel discussion entitled "Advances in Nuclear Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Education." It will be held on 23 April 2013 at the Graduate Institute of International Development Studies' Auditorium Jacques-Freyond (132 Rue de Lausanne) from 13:00 to 14:45.

The Ban All Nukes Generation, Graduate Institute Student Association, Graduate Institute's Students for Nuclear Disarmament Initiative, and Endignorance, with the support of the Federal Ministry for European and International Affairs of Austria, are co-sponsoring the event.

Speakers on the panel include: Ms. Beatrice Scarioni, Communications and Partnerships Officer, Endignorance; Mr. Christian N. Ciobanu, Geneva Representative, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation; Mr. Fujimori Toshiki, Hibakusha, Japan Confederation of A-and H- Bomb Sufferers' Organization (Nihon Hidankyo); Mr. Kunihiro Sakuma, Hibakusha, Hiroshima Association of A-bomb Sufferers (Hiroshima Hidankyo); Mr. Hiroshi Taka, Representative Director, Japan Council against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs (Gensuikyo); Mr. Alyn Ware, Global Coordinator, Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament; and Dr. William Potter, Director, James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies.



## Side event report: *Nuclear Weapons: The State of Play*

Katherine Prizeman | *Global Action to Prevent War*

Co-organized by the Centre for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament (CNND) and the Geneva Centre for Security Policy, the event “Nuclear Weapons: The State of Play” featured a panel discussion based on a new publication from CNND. The publication seeks to evaluate the performance of both nuclear and non-nuclear weapon states against benchmarks that have been set by the 2010 nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference (RevCon), the Nuclear Security Summits (NSS 2010 and 2012), and the International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament (ICNND). The event was sponsored by the governments of Australia and Japan, as ICCND is a joint initiative of these two states.

Opening remarks were offered by Ambassadors Woolcott and Amano of Australia and Japan, respectively, as well as Ambassador Cornel Feruta of Romania, the Chair of the current session of the Preparatory Committee (PrepCom). Professor Gareth Evans, Co-Chair of ICNND, presented the substance of the “State of Play” report, describing the progress, or lack thereof, in achieving the concrete benchmarks. The report provides a “traffic light” system of analysis for the 76 items adopted in the 2010 NPT Rev Con (the 64-point Action Plan and a few others), the 61 points embodied in the outcomes of the NSSs in 2010 and 2012, and the 76 items adopted through the ICNND. With regards to ICCND, only one item has been achieved, namely the “State of Play” publication as a follow-up to its 2009 report.

Professor Evans discussed the report’s findings according to thematic categories (disarmament, non-proliferation, security, and peaceful uses) as well as according to the specific instruments. He noted that the “most progress” has been made in the items covered by the NSSs, although Evans admitted that “the bar was not set very high” and advised realism about the nature of the commitments evaluated as the number of items that have had “progress” could be deceptive. He noted that much of the progress made in the nuclear security area has been cosmetic and driven by the relevant summits in Washington, DC and Seoul. Moreover, the evaluation of the NPT RevCon outcomes revealed that although some progress has been made, the items of highest importance and concern have not been sufficiently addressed. For example, although some items related to the Middle East Nuclear Weapon Free Zone have been achieved (a facilitator has been appointed and some preparations undertaken), the crucial action to convene a conference for the establishment of the zone in 2012 has not. Other matters of most very concern, such as those related to the Com-

prehensive Test Ban Treaty, the Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty, and compliance and enforcement have not been adequately and fully addressed. Therefore, the brute numbers of progress must be more closely analyzed in terms of their priorities and thematic focus.

It was clear from the presentation that disarmament-related commitments have seen the least amount of tangible progress across the various instruments. Through modernization, all of the nuclear weapon states have engaged in activities contributing to the retention of nuclear weapons with a prominent place in security policy, thus illustrating little, if any, change in nuclear objectives and strategy. However, on a more positive note, the issue of the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons was identified as an area where greater pressure could be applied by civil society. Moreover, Professor Evans noted that this perspective must assume a central place in the debate on nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament in order to “remind policymakers what this is all about.” However, while praising the Oslo conference held in March 2013, he noted that this should not necessarily yield an alternative negotiating process, which unfortunately pre-judges and limits what this forum could accomplish in the future.

It was quite clear from the discussion that serious work related to achieving nuclear disarmament remains despite some minimal progress on the non-proliferation and nuclear security-related items. Examining closely and objectively the items that have been agreed in diverse multilateral fora is a stark reminder of the enormous work that remains for the international community and that the momentum generated from the adoption of the 2010 NPT Action Plan is seriously waning. The overall picture of this study is quite sobering and should serve to remind all relevant stakeholders of the seriousness and gravity of the tasks at hand in order to bring about comprehensive and universal nuclear disarmament. •



**Side event report: Beyond International Humanitarian Law***Anina Dalbert / Reaching Critical Will of WILPF*

Which bodies of law are applicable to nuclear weapons? What about emerging concepts such as ecocide? What can International Human Rights Law contribute and how and where is it applicable? What about compliance and accountability? And what are the implications of all those laws for disarmament diplomacy?

These were among the many questions that were discussed during this side event. The event was hosted by the Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy, and its Executive Director John Burroughs was the first to speak on the panel. As in his chapter on International Humanitarian Law (IHL) in the recent publication of *Reaching Critical Will, Unspeakable Suffering*, he touched upon the principles of distinction, proportionality, and precaution. The prohibition of indiscriminate attacks that falls under the principle of distinction is central in the context of nuclear weapons. This was one of the reasons why the use of nuclear weapons has been categorised as illegal by the International Committee of the Red Cross in a resolution in 2011. Furthermore, a detonation in a city would classify as a crime against humanity. A rather new concept is the one of ecocide, which could apply to nuclear weapons—i.e. the extensive damage and the long-term consequences to the environment of any nuclear explosion could classify as ecocide.

On the ‘threat of force’, we tend to forget one very obvious thing. That threat is actually forbidden within the UN Charter in Article 2(4) if “against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations”.

Madeleine Rees, Secretary General of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, gave a passionate statement about human rights and the incomplete and often separated bits and pieces of the puzzle of applicable law on nuclear weapons. It is high time to have a regulatory framework that brings these together. International Human Rights Law, with its non-discriminatory character, the obligations of states, and its applicability during times of armed conflict as well as peace, is highly important to highlight the illegality of a nuclear weapon detonation. It is disappointing that the 1996 International Court of Justice advisory opinion did not take Human Rights into account. Nevertheless, it is crucial to raise the topic of nuclear weapons as well as their excessive funding in human rights treaty bodies. In addition, the so-called Responsibility to Protect doctrine can also apply to the possession as well as the deployment of such weapons. If connected with the existing prohibition of genocide,

and if such a crime is reasonably foreseeable, states have an obligation to hinder such an event. In this context, regarding the possession of nuclear weapons and the reasonable fear that if they were used it would constitute genocide, it may be concluded that all states have an obligation and a responsibility to influence those states that possess nuclear weapons to disarm and not to use them.

Ambassador Paul Meyer from the Simons Foundation talked about the humanitarian consequences of a nuclear detonation in diplomatic settings. These have been known for decades but were articulated for the first time in an official text in the 2010 NPT Action Plan. Unfortunately, many states that are otherwise strong on IHL felt that other commitments to alliances, namely NATO, would prevent them from endorsing this view in joint statements. It is crucial that complementary steps are taken on issues such as security doctrines and verification processes. However, in order to change the game so to speak, law alone, or especially when only on paper and not enforced, will not be enough to tackle this challenging issue. •

**Place des Nations, Geneva  
Tuesday, April 23,  
9:00-17:00**

**International Day of Action for Nuclear  
Disarmament**

**Organized by CANVA \*, Maison de  
Vigilance, STOP Nuclear Weapons,  
International Peace Bureau and NGO  
Committee for Disarmament.**

**9:00-11:00 + animations  
12:30 press conference of NGOs  
2:00 p.m., 3:00 p.m., 4:00 p.m. puppet show  
"Punch and missiles"**

-----  
**Discussion Evening 18:15-21:30  
Maison des Associations, 15 rue des Savoises  
(tram 15 to the Place du Cirque)  
Snack offered.**

**Debate on the various planned actions, eg.  
the fasting action 6-9 August in Paris,  
Burghfield / Aldermaston, Büchel / Berlin**

-----  
\* CANVA ((Coordination of Non-violent Actions by  
the Communauté de l'Arche)





## Side event report: Nuclear weapons in Europe

*Benedetta Cavagna di Gualdana | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF*

This seminar featured David Krieger, of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation (NAPF), Arielle Denis of the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN), Kate Hudson, of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND), Reiner Braun of the International Association of Lawyers against Nuclear Arms (IALANA) and INES, Susi Snyder of IKV Pax Christi, and Jackie Cabasso of the Western States Legal Foundation. It was organized by IALANA, INES, International Peace Bureau, and International Network of Engineers and Scientists against Proliferation (INESAP).

Arielle Denis spoke about the conference on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons that took place in Oslo, Norway on 4-5 March 2013. She embodied the enthusiasm emerging from the conference- and discussed how it has helped to shift the discourse on nuclear weapons. She explained the engaging and new method of interaction on the nuclear weapons issue- different from all other bodies that talk about them. She noted that 127 governments, a range of civil society, the International Committee of the Red Cross and Red Crescent and a number of UN agencies were also present and actively contributed to the discussions.

Kate Hudson focused her opening remarks on nuclear weapons in the United Kingdom, and her hope that the UK would be the first of the P5 to disarm. This stems from the critical engagement of the public on finance and threat perceptions. She also explained that politicians are also focusing on the cost of the nuclear weapons related to the financial crisis; and the fact that a nuclear threat from others is not real anymore, so the maintenance of the nuclear arsenal is not seen as necessary. According to Kate, in order to achieve disarmament in the UK a grassroots campaign is necessary to make pressure on the politicians.

Reiner Braun talked about the situation in Germany, and how times have changed so much since reunification. The eastern part of the country now has no nuclear weapons while the western part hosts twenty US B61 gravity bombs. The majority of German society and politicians want the removal of the weapons from German territory, and it was part of the 2009 Germany government coalition agreement. These US bombs are due to be modernized over the course of the next ten years. The modernised bomb will have new capabilities- and potentially new targeting plans. The German air force also trains to drop these nuclear weapons, preparing for a clear violation of Article II of the NPT.

Susi Snyder started her remarks by questioning how sovereign states who host US nuclear weapons really are- and using the extensive US military basing

in Germany as an example. She also discussed the Russian arsenal- and reminded participants that Russia also has territory, and nuclear weapons, in Europe. Susi went on to discuss that while the US is preparing to spend at least \$10 billion modernising the B61, host states are mandated to replace their delivery systems- namely new fighter planes. She used the example of the Netherlands, where a million euro are spent to simply house the current F16s, and untold amounts will likely be spent on the replacement Joint Strike Fighter (or F35). Lastly, she chided NATO members for their hypocritical calls for transparency, when they themselves do not engage in transparent debates on nuclear tasks in their own countries.

Jackie Cabasso declared that the nuclear weapons are anti-democratic. The US government is modernising its nuclear weapons and the amount of money that will be spent during this fiscal year is the largest amount in history. The B61-12 bombs are the most expensive weapons in the American history. •



## HAPPY BIRTHDAY SOFIA!

**News in Brief***Mia Gandenberger and Gabriella Irsten | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF*

The following is not a comprehensive summary of all statements and positions but rather a snapshot of a few key highlights from the general debate on Monday, 22 April 2013.

**Disarmament**

- Arab Group, Cuba, NAC, NAM, Egypt, New Zealand, Singapore, South Africa, Switzerland, and Turkey criticized lack of tangible progress on nuclear disarmament.
- NAC argued that the "continuing existence of around 20,000 nuclear weapons defies logic, is unjustifiable, and is clearly incompatible with the integrity and sustainability of the nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation regime."
- NAM South Africa said reductions are good but do not substitute for nuclear disarmament measures.
- Sri Lanka called for a ban on nuclear weapons.
- UAE called for the use, threat, and possession of nuclear weapons to be banned.
- Philippines called for a nuclear weapons convention, noting that it would not undermine the NPT, but rather would help fulfil state party obligations.
- France feared that creating "parallel processes" would undermine the NPT.

**Modernization**

- NAM said vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons jeopardizes the integrity and credibility of the NPT and expressed concern with the use of new technologies for upgrading existing nuclear weapons systems and developing new types of nuclear weapons.
- Egypt said that vertical proliferation is a serious challenge since all of the NWS continue to modernize their weapons, facilities, and their means of delivery.
- South Africa warned that the development of new categories of nuclear weapons and delivery systems indicates that some continue to harbour aspirations for the indefinite retention of these instruments of destruction, contrary to their legal obligations and political commitments.

**International humanitarian law (IHL)**

- NAM and Philippines stated that nuclear weapons are illegal under international law, particularly IHL.

**Humanitarian consequences**

- NAC, Australia, Egypt, Philippines, South Africa, Switzerland, Turkey, and UAE expressed concern about the humanitarian consequences of the use of nuclear weapons.
- Egypt argued that while NWS say they recognize the humanitarian effects of nuclear weapons, they have not done enough to disarm.
- NAC reiterated that no state or organisation can mitigate the humanitarian effects of nuclear weapons.
- Switzerland pointed out that the conference in Oslo is perfectly consistent with the spirit of the final document of the 2010 review conference, as that document had introduced the humanitarian dimension of nuclear disarmament as a new avenue to facilitate implementation of article VI.
- Australia, Japan, New Zealand, Philippines, Switzerland, and Turkey welcomed or noted the Oslo conference.
- NAC, Australia, Philippines, and Turkey welcomed the offer of Mexico to hold a follow-up conference on this issue.

**Non-proliferation**

- NAC and Egypt stated that as long as some states continue to possess nuclear weapons, others will aspire to acquire them.

**Iran**

- EU called on Iran to engage in confidence-building proposals presented by the E3+3.
- South Africa rejected any threat of military intervention regarding Iran and called for "reasonable requests" to be "heeded with pragmatism and creativity".

**DPRK**

- EU, Australia, Estonia, Japan, South Africa, and Switzerland condemned the DPRK nuclear test on 12 February 2013 and called on it to abandon its current path.
- EU condemned the announcement that the DPRK is restarting its nuclear facilities at Yongbyon, including the 5 MW reactors and its uranium enrichment.
- Sri Lanka said the situation on the Korean peninsula highlights the urgency of the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

*continued on next page*

**Middle East WMD free zone (MEWMDFZ)**

- Arab Group, NAC, NAM, Australia, China, Cuba, Egypt, Estonia, Japan, New Zealand, Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Turkey, and United Arab Emirates called for the establishment of the conference on a WMD free zone in the ME to be convened as soon as possible.
- Russia said that the co-sponsors of the Middle East WMDFZ conference did not have the authority to postpone it.
- USA said it will “work towards creating conditions” for a successful MEWMDFZ conference.
- France said the facilitator is working hard to create the favourable conditions.

**Nuclear weapon free zones (NWFZ)**


- Arab Group and the Philippines called for further consultations on the Bangkok treaty in order for the NWS to ratify it.

**Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)**

- EU, Australia, and Singapore welcomed the ratification of the CTBT by Brunei Darussalam and Chad.

**Nuclear safety and security**

- Egypt criticised the lack of resources directed towards technical cooperation with the IAEA.
- Switzerland pointed out that the Fukushima accident serves as a reminder of the importance of nuclear safety and encouraged states to implement the IAEA Action Plan on Nuclear Safety. •



**ican**  
International Campaign  
to Abolish Nuclear Weapons

**IT DOES NOT TAKE A  
GENIUS TO UNDERSTAND**

**THAT 19,000 NUCLEAR  
WEAPONS**

**ARE A CATASTROPHE  
WAITING TO HAPPEN**

**✗ A BAN IS THE ONLY SOLUTION**

## CALENDAR OF EVENTS

When	What	Where	Who
8:00-8:50	Abolition 2000	Room XVI	Abolition 2000
9:00-9:50	Government briefing for civil society: United States	Room XVI	Reaching Critical Will
9:00-17:00	International Day of Action for Nuclear Disarmament	Place des Nations	CANVA, Maison de Vigilance, STOP Nuclear Weapons, International Peace Bureau, and Geneva NGO Committee for Disarmament
10:00-13:00	Plenary: General debate	Assembly Hall	
10:00-13:00	Entente Nucleaire? The 'Teutates' Treaties between UK and France	Room XVI	Christian Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, Abolition 2000 UK, Armes nucleaires STOP
10:00-17:00	Exhibition "For a Nuclear Weapon-Free World: Hiroshima & Nagasaki Speak"	Hall XIV	Japan Council against A & H Bombs (Gensuikyo)
13:15-14:45	Film screening: "The Ultimate Wish: Ending the Nuclear Age"	Room XVI	Nagasaki Youth Delegation
13:15-14:45	Reducing the role of nuclear weapons: why it matters	Assembly Hall	Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Initiative (NPDI)
13:15-14:45	Practical steps towards transparency in nuclear disarmament	Room XI	UNIDIR
13:00-14:45	Advances in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation education	Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Auditorium Jaques-Freyond, 132 Rue de Lausanne	Nuclear Age Peace Foundation and Ban All Nukes generation
15:00-18:00	Plenary: General debate	Assembly Hall	
15:00-17:00	Modernisation and New Weapons Systems	Room XVI	INES, IPB, WFC
18:00-19:00	Preparing for simulated negotiations of a nuclear-weapons convention	Room XVI	Regina Hagen
18:00-19:30	Everything You Treasure: For a World Free of Nuclear Weapons: Opening Reception for Exhibit	Hall XIV	UNIDIR, ICAN, and Soka Gakkai International <i>RSVP by 22 April to Ms. Tae Takahashi, UNIDIR</i>
18:15-21:30	International NGO meeting	Maison des Associations 15 Rue des Savoises	International Peace Bureau