



NPT NEWS IN REVIEW

Civil society perspectives on the 2014 nuclear Non-Proliferation
Treaty Preparatory Committee 28 April–9 May 2014



Reaching Critical Will

30 April 2014
Vol. 12, No. 3

IN THIS ISSUE

- 1 | Editorial**
- 2 | Russia and the
US respond to
Nuclear Zero
lawsuits**
- 3 | Joint appeal from
Japanese NGOs**
- 4 | Calendar of
events**
- 5 | Abolition Papers**
- 5 | Hibakusha
Testimony**
- 6 | M4P Youth Forum**
- 6 | Don't Bank on the
Bomb**
- 8 | Revolution on
nuclear tech**
- 9 | Challenges to
Trident**
- 10 | News in Brief**

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

EDITORIAL: REPORTING AND RESPONSIBILITY

Beatrice Fihn | *Reaching Critical Will of WILPF*

As the NPT approaches its 45th anniversary, concerns about its implementation are more prominent than ever. Despite familiar references to the “three pillars” throughout the general debate, disarmament has stood out as the most prominent theme. Or, better put, the lack of disarmament. Against the backdrop of a rapidly evolving initiative focused on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons, expectations are growing by the day for nuclear-armed states to make progress on nuclear disarmament.

The five NPT nuclear-armed states have now submitted their reports on implementation of action 5, 20, and 21 of the NPT action plan. The reports follow a fixed set of headings, but the content varies widely. While China quotes Sun Tzu, France mainly highlights accomplishments from before 2010. As noted in our 2014 NPT Action Plan monitoring report, few achievements on action 5 have been recorded since 2010. In its report, the United States announced its updated nuclear warhead numbers of 4,804, reflecting a reduction of 309 warheads since 2009. With that pace, we could expect to reach zero in 62 years.

It is clear to most at the PrepCom that the action plan and article VI are not being implemented adequately by the nuclear-armed states. Nor does that seem likely to change anytime soon. The United Kingdom, for example, argued that the action plan “was not a time-limited five year exercise” and should be rolled over to the next review cycle.

Fortunately, the implementation of the NPT and its 2010 action plan is not solely the responsibility of the nuclear-armed states. Action 1 highlights that the implementation of the treaty, including article VI is a collective responsibility of all states parties.

In light of this, the encouraging discussions around the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons show that non-nuclear-armed states are making a significant contribution

towards the implementation of article VI. In its national statement, Austria announced that the third conference on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons will be held on 8–9 December in Vienna. Alexander Kmentt of Austria noted that “the Vienna conference provides a productive forum to generate momentum for progress on nuclear disarmament. With this initiative, Austria wants to strengthen the NPT of which the humanitarian dimension is an integral and essential part.”

While one or two states—such as France—predictably criticized the conferences on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons as “parallel processes” that could somehow undermine the NPT, such arguments continue to fall flat.

The NPT is a treaty, not a negotiating forum. Its article VI was never intended to deliver nuclear disarmament within the preparatory committees and review conferences. No matter what definition of article VI one adopts, multilateral nuclear disarmament was always going to be negotiated “outside” the NPT.

Nuclear disarmament will not happen overnight. But all states parties to the NPT have committed to multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations, and need to assume shared responsibility for this. It will take determined leadership to achieve this. The reports and statements continue to suggest that such leadership will not come from the nuclear-armed states themselves.

Leadership must therefore come from those states that have already rejected nuclear weapons, from those that have already concluded that the world is safer without them. It is time for non-nuclear-armed states to assume responsibility for implementing article VI and create the conditions for nuclear disarmament. It's time to begin a process to outlaw nuclear weapons. •

RUSSIA AND THE US RESPOND TO NUCLEAR ZERO LAWSUITS

Rick Wayman | Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

The “Nuclear Nine”—US, Russia, UK, France, China, Israel, India, Pakistan, and Democratic People’s Republic of Korea—were sued last week by the Republic of the Marshall Islands for breach of Article VI of the NPT and related provisions of customary international law. Very little has been said thus far by representatives of the offending nations.

On Monday, the Russian Foreign Ministry issued a statement about the lawsuit. One excuse they made is: “Russia has reduced its strategic nuclear potential by more than 80 percent and its non-strategic nuclear weapons by three-quarters from their peak numbers.”

Given what is widely known about the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons, it is inexcusable for any nation to maintain an arsenal of any size. Perhaps Russia does not realize this because it actively chose to boycott the conferences on humanitarian impacts organized by Norway in 2013 and Mexico in 2014. Russia’s continued boycotting of multilateral initiatives for nuclear disarmament (including the Open-Ended Working Group) demonstrates a lack of good faith effort.

Laurie Ashton, counsel to the Marshall Islands, said, “A country that agrees to reduce antiquated nuclear stockpiles while spending hundreds of billions to make other categories of nuclear weapons more lethal is clearly still arms racing. The people of the world can see right through any argument that responsibility for stalled nuclear disarmament rests elsewhere.”

Russia also claimed, “For past 45 years, the international community has made no serious efforts [to achieve] complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.”

Phon van den Biesen, co-agent of the Republic of the Marshall Islands in the cases before the International Court of Justice, replied this point on Monday when a member of Russia’s delegation raised it at a side event. Phon said, “You’re talking about the next lawsuit.”

This lawsuit clearly spells out the allegations against Russia. It has not negotiated in good faith for an end to the nuclear arms race at an early date—the NPT has been in force for over 44 years and Russia continues, along with other nuclear-armed nations, to modernize its nuclear arsenal. Russia has not negotiated in good faith for nuclear disarmament. This violates Article VI of the NPT and customary international law.

The US State Department also released a short statement about the lawsuits, saying, “The U.S. is dedicated to achieving the peace and security of a world without

nuclear weapons, consistent with our obligations under the [NPT].”

This might be the first time the Obama administration has written the words “peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons” and not immediately followed it with some version of “not in my lifetime.” If the US is dedicated to a world without nuclear weapons, why is it modernizing its nuclear arsenal and planning which nuclear weapons it will deploy in the 22nd century?

The US also claimed, “We have a proven track record of pursuing a consistent, step-by-step approach to nuclear disarmament—the most recent example being the New START Treaty.”

The New START Treaty, which—at best—was a step forward for arms control (not nuclear disarmament), was signed four years ago. It was ratified by the US at a steep cost—an agreement to modernize nuclear weapons and build new nuclear weapon facilities. At this rate, complete nuclear disarmament will not be achieved in this lifetime or, as former US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton stated, “in successive lifetimes.”

It is clear that the step-by-step approach promoted by the P5 is little more than a delaying tactic to placate those who are either not paying attention or satisfied with the daily threats to humanity posed by nuclear weapons. •

NPT NEWS IN REVIEW 30 APRIL 2014 | Vol. 12, No. 3

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
web: 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.



JOINT APPEAL FROM JAPANESE NGOS FOR THE NPT PREPCOM

28 April 2014

We, Japanese NGOs working for nuclear weapons abolition, make the following appeal to all NPT States parties and citizens of the world at the timing of the 3rd Session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT PrepCom).

1. To participate in the Vienna Conference on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons, and to make progress towards outlawing nuclear weapons.

We sincerely welcome the developments that since the 2012 NPT PrepCom, support for the joint statements on the humanitarian aspects of nuclear weapons has continued to spread, and international conferences on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons have been held in Norway and Mexico. As citizens of Japan, which experienced the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, we are greatly encouraged by the fact that the inhumanity of nuclear weapons, about which we have long appealed, is now becoming a common recognition of the international community. We have high expectations of the 3rd such international conference to be held later this year in Vienna by the Austrian Government. All countries should participate in this conference, and actively contribute to making progress in the debate. We hope that countries participating in this conference will go a step further than deepening understanding of the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons, and that the debate will progress to concrete actions towards outlawing nuclear weapons.

2. Countries dependent upon nuclear weapons should deeply reduce the role of nuclear weapons, working towards eliminating it.

The call to diminish the role of nuclear weapons in security policies as set forth in the NPT Review Conference Action Plan is a challenge not only for the nuclear-weapon states, but also for all non-nuclear-weapon-states which are dependent upon nuclear weapons. The fact that such countries under the so-called "nuclear umbrella" are insisting upon nuclear deterrence, and even opposing declarations of no first use of nuclear weapons, is of grave concern. We call on such non-nuclear-weapon states to revise this stance, and to deeply reduce the role of nuclear weapons in their security policy, working towards eliminating it. These countries should actively provide information and reports and explanation to the NPT States parties as to how they are reducing their own dependence on nuclear weapons.

3. To cease nuclear energy cooperation with countries not party to the NPT.

The facts that Japan is continuing negotiations in nuclear energy cooperation with India, a nuclear weapon state which is not party to the NPT, and Australia is moving to export uranium also to India, are serious challenges to the NPT regime. While this nuclear energy cooperation is presented on the surface as civil cooperation, it virtually supports nuclear weapons development and exacerbates the nuclear arms race in South Asia. We call on all countries to cease nuclear energy related export plans to states not party to the NPT.

4. Considering int'l concerns regarding its plutonium stocks, Japan should cease reprocessing activities.

Japan's stockpiling of more than 44 tonnes of separated plutonium within and outside the country is of great concern for nuclear nonproliferation and nuclear security. The people of Japan, which experienced the atomic bombings, support the country's three non-nuclear principles, and the strong public opinion in Japan will never permit the transfer of this plutonium to be used for nuclear weapons. However Japan's possession of plutonium and reprocessing activities must not be used as an excuse for other countries to call for the same activities or status. We call on Japan not to operate the Rokkasho reprocessing plant, and to withdraw from its nuclear fuel cycle policy, including reprocessing.

Signatories (as of April 28, 2014)

HIROSE Masato (Hibakusha Testimony Association of Nagasaki)
 KANO Hidemichi (Japan Congress Against A- and H-Bombs (GENSUIKIN))
 KAWAI Kimiaki (Soka Gakkai Peace Committee)
 KAWASAKI Akira (Peace Boat)*
 NAITO Masayoshi (Japan Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms, JALANA)*
 NAKAMURA Mitsutaka (Peace Ring, Student Group for Peace Issues in Meiji Gakuin University)
 MORITAKI Haruko (Hiroshima Alliance for Nuclear Weapons Abolition, HANWA)*
 TANAKA Terumi (Japan Confederation of A-and H-Bomb Sufferers Organizations, Nihon Hidankyo)*
 TAKAHARA Takao (International Peace Research Institute (PRIME), Meiji Gakuin University)
 TASAKI Toyoko (Tokyo Association of Second-Generation Hibakusha)
 TSUCHIDA Yayoi (Japan Council Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs (Gensuikyo))
 TOMONAGA Masao (Nagasaki Citizens Assembly for the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons)*

* Joint Representatives of Japan NGO Network for Nuclear Weapons Abolition (nuclear.abolition.japan@gmail.com)



CALENDAR OF EVENTS

When	What	Where	Who
8:00-8:50	Abolition Caucus	Room C	Abolition 2000
9:00-9:50	Government briefing for NGOs: United States	Room C	Reaching Critical Will
10:00-13:00	Plenary	Trusteeship Council Chamber	
10:00-13:00	For a nuclear weapons and WMDs in the Middle East; an historic new Israeli citizens' initiative	Room C Conference Building	International Association of Peace Messenger Cities
13:15-14:45	After Fukushima: Time to phase out nuclear power and move to sustainable energy	Room C Conference Building	Abolition 2000
13:15-14:45	Civil society activities toward the 2015 NPT Review Conference: Putting Hiroshima's experience into action for the future	Room B Conference Building	Hiroshima Prefectural Government
13:15-14:45	Nuclear weapons and the moral compass	Church Center for the United Nations 777 UN Plaza	Permanent Mission of the Philippines and the Global Security Institute
13:15-14:45	Presentation of PIR Center's White Paper "NPT Article VI and Implementation of the 2010 Review Conference Decisions"	Room 9 Conference Building	PIR Center (The Russian Center for Policy Studies)
13:15-14:45	Strategies for a world without nuclear weapons – how to reach an international draft agreement and a start of negotiations?	Church Center for the United Nations 777 UN Plaza	IPB, INES, IALANA, Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung—New York Office
13:15-14:45	Preparing for deep cuts: overcoming the gridlock in nuclear arms control	German House First Avenue at 49th Street	The Permanent Mission of the Federal Republic of Germany
15:00-18:00	Plenary	Trusteeship Council Chamber	
15:00-17:50	Time for action to establish a Northeast Asia nuclear weapon free zone	Room C Conference Building	Peace Depot
19:00	Stories From Atomic Bomb Survivors: Hibakusha Speak	Goddard Riverside Community Center 88th Street & Columbus Ave	Peace Action Manhattan



ABOLITION PAPER #3

Reaching Critical Will and Article 36

A ban treaty would reduce incentives for nuclear weapons

A treaty framework for the prohibition and elimination of nuclear weapons would seek to remove the international and domestic incentives that compel governments to support nuclear weapons. Existing incentives to invest in nuclear weapons are contrary to the security, economic, and material interests of citizens as well as to the interests of international peace and stability.

A treaty banning nuclear weapons is not antagonistic towards nuclear-armed states. Rather, it should assist those states that find themselves caught up in a complex situation of conflicting legal norms (where the use of nuclear weapons cannot be reconciled with the rules of international humanitarian law); embedded national identity politics (where the power and prestige associated with nuclear weapons plays a role in constructing the national identity of certain states); longstanding commercial and industrial relationships with nuclear weapon production; and a questionable belief in “nuclear deterrence”.

For states that have a national debate over the development or renewal of nuclear weapons, the existence of an international process to prohibit such weapons would fundamentally alter the political landscape, bolstering the case against renewal.

A framework treaty banning nuclear weapons could include a prohibition on financial or material support to companies involved with nuclear weapons. Such a prohibition would increase the stigmatisation of nuclear weapons by reducing incentives for private companies to accept any work related to nuclear weapons. It could also prevent public funds from supporting any entity involved with nuclear weapons. In this regard, a treaty ban on nuclear weapons could raise the political and economic costs of maintaining or relying on nuclear weapons.

By reinforcing the international stigma attached to these weapons, such an approach would support genuine efforts by leaders within nuclear-armed states to disentangle themselves from a situation that puts them and our wider human society at great risk. •

REPORT: HIBAKUSHA TESTIMONY

Gabriella Irsten | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

Conference room C was full to the limit when Mr. Michio Hakarwa and Ms. Reiko Yamada, survivors of the atomic bombings of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, shared their stories and experiences from the day the bombs were dropped and the almost 70 years that have passed since.

This event was an initiative between the two NGO's Peace Boat and the local non-profit Youth Arts New York's Hibakusha Stories. Both groups focus on bringing forward the testimonies of atomic bomb survivors (hibakusha) to local citizens, in order for them to understand the reality of nuclear war.

In addition to sharing their personal stories, the hibakusha also discussed the long history of discrimination with which they have had to struggle since the bombing. Ms. Reiko Yamada explained that some hibakusha have not been able to get married or have children. Some hibakusha, due to this discrimination, have chosen to not tell their own family members that they are atomic bomb survivors. She also stressed the support that the hibakusha community has offered and provided to the citizens of Fukushima after the nuclear disasters. Together with the city of Fukushima, they have talked to the energy company running the Fukushima power plant and the Japanese government in order to provide and guarantee medical help for the survivors, which will be needed for the rest of their lives.

The hibakusha have for many years worked towards highlighting the humanitarian effects of nuclear weapons and what will actually happen if a nuclear weapons is ever used again. The event also heard from Tomoshisa Taue, Mayor of Nagasaki, and students from Nagasaki University, who shared their commitment to continue telling the hibakusha's stories for generations to come. The event also heard reflections from the grandson of the US President Harry Truman, Mr. Clifton Truman Daniel, who has worked together with the hibakusha for many years. •



REPORT: M4P YOUTH FORUM

Arianna Framvik Malik | *Reaching Critical Will of WILPF*

When high school students (from Eisin High School) gathered in Hiroshima's Peace Park in 2008 to ask other students if they knew what happened on the 6th and 9th August in 1945, more than fifty percent were not fully aware of what had transpired. For this reason, in an effort to ensure that their history and the abominable legacy of the nuclear bombs will not be forgotten, high school and university students from Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and Okinawa are cooperating with Mayors for Peace.

Mayors for Peace was established in 1982 on the initiative of then-Hiroshima Mayor Takeshi Araki. The organization's 2020 Vision Campaign asks mayors to support negotiations towards the elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2020. So far, mayors from over 6000 cities in 158 countries have become members.

During Tuesday's seminar, representatives from the Youth Forum of Mayors for Peace talked about their work to raise awareness amongst people in their hometowns and neighboring countries with the aim of promoting greater understanding. Having grown up in Hiroshima and Nagasaki and having spoken directly with some of the survivors of the atomic bombings, the Hibakusha, the Youth Forum participants understand the horrors of the A-bomb. They know that almost seventy years after the physical terror of the detonations, the victims are still suffering emotionally. With the average age of the Hibakusha survivors now seventy-eight, the young peace activists are trying to fill the age gap by getting more people interested in the issue. It is working. Today more and more people in Japan are once again interested in the abolition of nuclear weapons. And because of these efforts, Hibakusha who have not spoken up in the past are now letting their voices be heard.

A petition for the abolition of nuclear weapons has collected over 300,000 signatures in six years. For the students, this petition represents a peaceful yet powerful way that people can voice their wish for abolition. Hoping that their message becomes a global message, the students of the youth forum noted that our existence might be small, but it is not insignificant. Even though some say it is impossible to abolish nuclear weapons, that doesn't mean we shouldn't try. •

REPORT: DON'T BANK ON THE BOMB

Alexandra Hiniker | *PAX*

PAX organized the side event "Don't Bank on the Bomb: Divestment from nuclear weapons" to address the motivation, methodology, and impact of the Don't Bank on the Bomb project, which documents the level of private sector investment in producers of nuclear weapons.

A film by the Swedish Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (SLMK) introduced the issue.

Ray Acheson, Director of Reaching Critical Will (RCW) presented the updated findings of the RCW report on global nuclear weapon modernization entitled *Assuring destruction forever* illustrating the products of these investments, namely the continued modernization and maintenance of nuclear weapons. She noted that current plans for modernization mean that nuclear weapons will exist until the 2030s or even 2040s, and that, consequently, nuclear-armed countries are not planning on implementing their NPT Article VI agreements for a long time.

Susi Snyder, PAX's program manager for nuclear disarmament, spoke about private sector investment in companies maintaining and modernizing nuclear weapons. This approach provides a wide opportunity for action because most people are connected to the global financial industry in one way or another, and can therefore have influence on policies on financing nuclear weapons. The 2013 report shows that 298 financial institutions invested US\$314 billion in 27 nuclear weapons producers. There were no companies in either Africa or Latin America, which are both under regional nuclear weapon-free zones. More than 30 financial institutions already have solid policies in place.

To demonstrate how the report's findings can be translated into action, Josefin Lind of SLMK explained how civil society was able to get banks in Sweden to divest from nuclear weapons producers. Campaigners sent letters to the four Swedish banks covered in the *Don't Bank on the Bomb* report, and followed up with meetings and op-eds. One bank had already divested, not because of any policy, but because of an internal decision. She described the spontaneous campaign that emerged, simply because bank customers learned they were financing nuclear weapons producers. This has now changed policies in several banks, and campaigners are facilitating further changes by encouraging bank officials to share best practices. She pointed out that this is an easy issue, and that this also provided a link for non-nuclear weapon states. For those who have been involved in nuclear disarmament for many years, these sorts of swift results are welcome indeed. •



Toward the 2015 NPT Review Conference:

Putting Hiroshima's Experience into Action for the Future

Organized by
Hiroshima Prefectural Government (Japan)

Time & Date: Wednesday, April 30, 2014,
13:15-14:30 (75 min)

Location: Conference Room B,
UN Building

Opening Remarks

- ❖ **Hiroshima Governor Hidehiko Yuzaki**, "Promotion of 'Hiroshima for Global Peace' Plan"
- ❖ **Hiroshima Mayor Kazumi Matsui**, "Promotion of '2020 Vision Campaign'"
- ❖ **Angela Kane**, UN High Representative for Disarmament Affairs

Panel Discussion

Subject: "Approaches to abolish nuclear weapons from the perspective of their humanitarian consequences" & "Monitoring of implementation of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation measures in the world"

Panel: (Subject to change)

Chair: **Nobumasa Akiyama***, Hitotsubashi University
Hidehiko Yuzaki, Hiroshima Governor
Kazumi Matsui, Hiroshima Mayor
Nobuyasu Abe*, Japan Atomic Energy Commission
Ray Acheson, Reaching Critical Will
Walter A. Füllermann, ICRC
Masako Toki, James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies,
 Monterey Institute of International Studies
Susi Snyder, IKV Pax Christi/ICAN

*Prof. Akiyama and Mr. Abe are members of the
 "Hiroshima for Global Peace" Plan Promotion Committee.



New Publication: *Hiroshima Report*

For further reading on our effort for nuclear disarmament, please refer to our report. *Hiroshima Report: Evaluation of Achievement in Nuclear Disarmament, Non-Proliferation and Nuclear Security: 2014* can be read and downloaded at:
<http://www.pref.hiroshima.lg.jp/site/peace-en/hiroshimareport2014e.html>

For the "Hiroshima for Global Peace" Plan website visit this URL:

<http://www.pref.hiroshima.lg.jp/site/peace-en>

Contact: Takuya Tazawa, **E-mail:** t-tazawa85737@pref.hiroshima.lg.jp

REPORT: THE REVOLUTION IN NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY

Andreas Tolf | IPPNW Sweden

Will the escalating use of autonomous weapons in modern warfare affect the role and use of nuclear weapons? Can we enjoy the fruits of the technical achievements without facing the problems that come with them? And what is the role of the peace movement of today?

This side event, organized by IPB, INES, WSLF, IALANA, and Rosa Luxemburg Stiftung—New York Office on 29 April, raised a wide range of interesting and relevant questions connected to the problems of the modern warfare. The seminar was chaired by Reiner Braun and featured panelists Andrew Lichterman (Western States Legal Foundation) and Dave Webb (CND).

Andrew Lichterman presented the problems of automated weapons systems. Despite the increasing use of drones, the dangers are not new. Computer systems for warning, command and control have played a major role in nuclear weapon systems for a long time. In the end, humans are left with short decision time to evaluate the incoming data.

Dave Webb stressed the great danger that results from taking humans out of the decision-making; where there is no room for compassion and thoughts for alternatives—true human qualities—there is a considerable risk of a quick and dangerous military escalation.

Autonomous weapons can be controlled from great distances, which make it easier to conduct surveillance or weapon attacks outside public control. Mr. Lichterman quoted the 1999 RAND study for the US Air Force: "Most US military operations for the foreseeable future will be undertaken with limited or less-than-majority American public support." The powerful military industrial complex, nourished during the Cold War, plays a major role in the development of the technology making this possible.

Mr. Lichterman did not believe that the development of autonomous weapons delivering nuclear weapons would be a greater danger than the present nuclear arsenals. However, the recent modernization of conventional weapons combine range, power, and accuracy with an effect that previously only could be provided by nuclear weapons and thus contributes to new instabilities between nuclear-weapon states and increases the risk of a conventional conflict escalating into a nuclear war.

Unfortunately, the risk of war between the major powers has been absent from the public debate in the recent years, and there is more concern about the nuclear weapons that do not exist than the thousands that do. The following discussion with the audience stressed the role of the civil society and peace movement. •

NPT PrepCom 2014 Expert Panels

US Nuclear Modernization

Thursday, May 1 at 3 pm • Room C

In the next decade, US "modernization" spending is projected to significantly expand the nuclear weapons complex. Experts discuss the dangerous implications, and the fight against these programs.

Marylia Kelley, Tri-Valley CAREs, Livermore, CA
Jay Coghlan, Nuclear Watch New Mexico
Hans Kristensen, Federation of American Scientists
Ashish Sinha, Alliance for Nuclear Accountability

B61 Life Extension Programs

Friday, May 2 at 10 am • Room C

B61 is the most expensive "modernization" program in US history. European and US nuclear policy experts discuss the issues with the program, as well as the international campaign to end it.

Susi Snyder, Pax
Jay Coghlan, Nuclear Watch New Mexico
Hans Kristensen, Federation of American Scientists
Rick Wayman, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

Contact Ashish Sinha at asinha@ananuclear.org for more information.



REPORT: CHALLENGES TO TRIDENT

Arianna Framvik Malik | *Reaching Critical Will of WILPF*

Monday's side event on the challenges to the UK nuclear weapons system Trident began with Nathalie Gauchet of Mouvement de la Paix talking about the ongoing nuclear weapons collaboration between France and the UK. The programme involves joint experiments in France in order to modernize both countries' weapons systems. Officially the collaboration began as an effort to minimize costs; unofficially it was done on order to promote UK's decision to keep their nuclear arsenal. According to Gauchet, France doesn't want to be the only nuclear-armed state in Europe.

Jeremy Corbyn, British MP for Labour, noted that in the United Kingdom, sixty percent of the population is against Trident. In 2016 the renewal of Trident is up for decision. Previously, modernizing the nuclear weapons system was done behind closed doors, but in 2006, Tony Blair and the Labour Party initiated a discussion on renewal of Trident in parliament. The upcoming decision is amongst the factors that has made the UK's nuclear weapons a matter of public discussion.

The United Kingdom has been faced with severe austerity and people are starting to see the connection between the hundreds of millions of pounds going into the upkeep and modernization of nuclear weapons and

the spending cuts being made in public policy. The trade union movement continues to support nuclear disarmament and the Scottish Trades Union Congress has argued that at a time of unprecedented austerity, spending on Trident diverts vital resources away from spending on social need and job creation.

This coming September, Scotland will hold a referendum for independence, leaving the UK with facing the possibility of having to relocate its nuclear warheads, based on submarines that are currently placed on Scottish territory. The Scottish National Party insists that should independence be won, the nuclear weapons placed on Scottish territory would have to go. Since there is no obvious place where Britain could relocate the nuclear weapons to, the issue has sparked a discussion within parliament and this is another reason that Trident has become an issue in the upcoming 2015 general election. •

a g e x p l o s i v e e l
k y m i l l e n i u m j v
r a d i a t i o n s o z b
o f e y t i r u c e s q h
x y c n e r a p s n a r t
d e v e l o p m e n t s i
y d n a g a s a k i b t d
a r s e n a l c d t g u d
v c r i t i c a l g s a k
c e n t r i f u g e r c l
c i y e c i t s u j u s i
f n c v q a d v o c a t e
o h g s n b k y t y b w k

radiation
security
centrifuge
development
transparency
arsenal
nagasaki
millenium
advocate
explosive
justice
critical



NEWS IN BRIEF

Mia Gandenberger | *Reaching Critical Will of WILPF*

Nuclear disarmament

- US said the numbers released under New START illustrate 85% reductions from the levels of 1967.
- Iraq, Libya, Thailand, Austria, Guatemala, and Colombia underlined the importance of the HLM on nuclear disarmament.
- The UK explained it shared the frustration over the pace of disarmament. However, it does not support movements towards the negotiation of the ban treaty.
- Estonia supported the building block approach in this context.
- Chile called for binding, verifiable, and universal instrument outlawing nuclear weapons.
- Austria stressed that as long as some states regard nuclear weapons as a legitimate security hedge for themselves, efforts to counter nuclear proliferation will always suffer from a fundamental contradiction and credibility deficit.
- Austria cautioned that for every legal instrument there is only a finite level of inconsistency or credibility deficits that can be absorbed before the fundamental equilibrium of broad support is disturbed.
- Bangladesh called for the commencement of negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention.

Action plan

- US and UK circulated reports on their activities using a "standard reporting form" developed by the P5.
- Russia said announced it would circulate its report.
- The UK explained it does not see the action plan as a time limited five year exercise.

Humanitarian impact

- US stressed it is important to ensure the memory of the human impact of nuclear weapons.
- The UK explained it was fully cognizant of the humanitarian consequences that could result from the use of nuclear weapons.
- Austria announced that the third international conference on the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons will take place on 8 and 9 December 2014 in Vienna. Chile expressed its support for the conference.

FMCT/CTBT

- The US explained the entry into force of the CTBT remains a top priority.

NWFZ

- The US, UK, and Russia expressed satisfaction about the progress toward signing the Central Asian NWFZ treaty as well as the protocol to the SEANWFZ treaty.
- EU, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, Syria, Libya, and Colombia called for the convening of the conference on establishing a MEWMDFZ.

Iran

- Russia, the EU, Austria, and Slovenia highlighted the Joint Plan of Action between the E3/EU+3 and Iran; the UK hoped that more progress could be achieved in the future.
- Saudi Arabia stressed that Iran must assure the states of the region of its compliance with its obligations by allowing access to the IAEA.

Ukraine

- Ukraine recalled its decision to renounce nuclear weapons in 1993 as part of the Budapest memorandum and the subsequent accession to NPT as a non-nuclear weapon state.
- US commended Ukraine on their decision to renounce nuclear weapons and expressed their appreciation for their clear sightedness on the matter.
- Estonia and Slovenia expressed the hope that the violation of the memorandum would not have more repercussions.
- Austria expressed their concern about some comments in recent times that have attempted to present this crisis in the Ukraine as a validation of nuclear weapons possession and nuclear deterrence.

Other

- The US explained that P5 engagement is a long-term investment designed to strengthen the NPT, build trust, and create a stronger foundation to pursue steps towards the goal of a world without nuclear weapons.



Wildfire>_ presents

Burn the NPT

A side-event unlike any other

Room C, Conference Building

1:15–2:45pm, Thursday 1 May 2014

Nuclear disarmament: time to change the game

www.wildfire-v.org



MAKE NUCLEAR WEAPONS HISTORY

OSLO 128 STATES

NAYARIT 146 STATES

VIENNA BE THERE!

