



# NPT NEWS IN REVIEW

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



Reaching Critical Will

1 May 2013  
Vol. 11, No. 8

## IN THIS ISSUE

- 1 | Editorial
- 2 | Event report:  
NGO briefing on  
the Middle East  
WMD free zone  
conference
- 2 | Event report:  
A mock NGO  
conference on  
the Middle East  
WMD free zone?
- 3 | Event report:  
Unspeakable  
suffering
- 4 | News in Brief
- 6 | 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.

## Walking out, or walking on?

Ray Acheson | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

When it walked out of the PrepCom on Monday afternoon, the Egyptian delegation said it cannot wait forever for the start of a process to establish a WMD free zone in the Middle East. More broadly, Ambassador Badr cited his delegation's frustration with making concessions for agreements that are never implemented—and then still being expected to comply with those concessions. While Egypt is the first country to walk out of an NPT meeting on this basis, it is certainly not alone in experiencing this frustration. Thus all NPT states parties, but especially those whose weapons are the main reason we come to these meetings, have the responsibility to address this problem.

The working paper by the League of Arab States on the Middle East WMD free zone gives a clear picture of mounting frustration. So do the cluster one statements by non-nuclear weapon states, which have waited more than 40 years for the fulfillment of article VI. Another indication of frustration can be found in the joint statement of 78 countries highlighting the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons. While the 14 states that possess or harbor nuclear weapons to try restrain discussions about nuclear weapons to techno-strategic terms, the rest of the world is demanding a conversation about the unspeakable suffering that would result from the use of these weapons of terror.

These frustrations illuminate the problem with the status quo, but also the solution.

The problem is that commitments are made but not implemented. Most states compromise to reach agreements—they accept less than they would otherwise, they offer other commitments in return. But sometimes before the ink is even dry, the countries that forced those concessions have walked away from or reinterpreted the agreement. Article VI. The 1995 resolution on the Middle East. Most of the 13 practical steps from 2000. Actions 5 and 21, among others, of the 2010 action plan. All are examples of this phenomenon within the NPT context.

The solution is to stop waiting for these countries to take the initiative to fulfill their commitments, and to prevent them from dictating how agreements are reached. When there is a known and established pattern of certain states forcing concessions and then walking away from the commitments they have made, other states should act to ensure this does not stand in the way of achieving collective security goals.

Moving from a state-centric to a humanitarian approach to security is an excellent start. The debate on the humanitarian impact reestablishes the fact that nuclear weapons are dangerous and destructive. It also emphasizes the perspective that disarmament is everyone's responsibility. In this shifting and insecure world, there are actions we can take and paths we can walk on without waiting for the obstacles to move themselves.

Egypt's walk-out, regardless of one's position on the matter, hinted at the potential fragility of the NPT. It made the point that the NPT regime is not so sacred that it can relegate important issues to an indefinite holding pattern. One easy way to address such frustration this is for all states to implement their commitments as reflected in the spirit and letter of the NPT and its outcome documents. Another is to engage constructively in the debate on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons—to talk about nuclear weapons as instruments of death and destruction, accept responsibility for getting rid of them, and take concrete action to outlaw and eliminate them. •



*"Obstacles are meant to be overcome"*  
—Rocki's Rock'n Blog

**Side event report: NGO briefing on the Middle East WMD free zone conference***Gabriella Irsten | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF*

On Tuesday morning, members of Ambassador Jaakko Laajava's facilitation team met with NGO representatives to explore the positive role that civil society can play in terms of a Middle East WMD free zone (MEWMDZF). The side event was sponsored by the Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP) and featured Amb. Päivi Kairamo from Finland; Mr. Hiroyuki Yamamoto from Japan; Amb. Hannu Kyröläinen, a representative of Laajava's team; Dr. Ayman Khalil from the Arab Institute for Security Studies (ACSIS); and the chair of the event, Amb. Fred Tanner from GCSP.

Representatives of civil society shared the same disappointment reflected by NPT states parties during the Monday afternoon plenary focusing on the issue of the MEWMDZF. Although no additional information was conveyed in this side event, the meeting did provide for a more interactive dialogue between the facilitator's team and other experts and civil society representatives—the type of dialogue that many would have liked to see in the plenary room on Monday afternoon.

Dr. Kairamo presented the joint publication “The Conference for a Middle East Weapons of Mass Destruction Free Zone” published by ACSIS and GCSP. He reminded the audience that the NPT 2010 outcome on the MEWMDZF was intended to be an on-going process and not a singular goal of setting up one meeting in Helsinki. He argued that the most worrying aspect of the postponement of the conference was the lack of information about the facilitator's next step. He concluded by calling for greater engagement with civil society in the region, as such actors have an important role in sharpening public opinions and debates. This was also reiterated by ICAN campaigner Sharon Dolev from Israel, who encouraged the facilitator to engage the Israel peace movement.

Seminar participants also discussed how the process could be reformed so that Israel would participate. Ms. Dolev explained that the conference being an outcome of the NPT is problematic, as Israel is not an NPT state party. Other obstacles that were debated included the possible use of chemical weapons in Syria and the Iranian nuclear programme.

Participants suggested alternative solutions for moving ahead on the establishment of the zone, including by revisiting the facilitator's mandate. Amb. Kyröläinen noted that the mandate given to Amb. Laajava was created by the NPT process, so reforming this mandate is a question for the NPT review cycle. He emphasized that the mandate specifically says that all states in the region must participate. •

**Side event report: A mock NGO conference on the Middle East WMD free zone?***Gabriella Irsten | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF*

Tuesday's second side event on the topic of a WMD free zone in the Middle East (MEWMDZF) was sponsored by the Egyptian Council for Foreign Affairs.

The side event presented the idea of holding a mock conference on the topic of the MEWMDZF with the objective of stimulating the intergovernmental process and “outside the box thinking”. Simulations and mock conferences have been used within the human rights field for a long time in order to progress on different issues. The Council therefore wanted to incorporate this into the disarmament field as a tool to overcome the obstacles preventing the convening of a conference on the MEWMDZF. In addition to triggering new thinking and ideas, a mock conference could also work as a preparatory conference on the issues that will be discussed in Helsinki. Such issues could include verification, the agenda, who will participate, and what kind of security assurances could be given.

The seminar also discussed the fact that more attention is needed on the shared threats that the Middle East is facing. The MEWMDZF requires a collective effort and cooperation addressing these challenges. It has also become clear, with the stalemate of the Helsinki conference, that we need a second track or a plan B to move the issue forward if the deadlock continues.

The mock conference will therefore explore alternative options with participants from civil society and pertinent people that can have an important role in bringing the lesson learned back to their capitals. •

**NPT NEWS IN REVIEW**  
**1 May 2013 | Vol. 11, No. 8**

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.*

## Side event report: Unspeakable suffering: the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons

Anina Dalbert | *Reaching Critical Will of WILPF*

During Tuesday's side event on the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons, the room was packed with people. This argued the Chair of the event, Ambassador Benno Laggner of Switzerland, shows how utterly important this issue has become. He outlined some past events that have helped to place the humanitarian perspective on nuclear weapons on the international agenda, such as the 2010 NPT outcome document, the 2011 ICRC resolution, the Oslo conference, and last week's joint statement by 78 states to the NPT. These developments clearly have reframed the debate on nuclear weapons.

Beatrice Fihn of Reaching Critical Will introduced the recent publication "Unspeakable Suffering: the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons". The report focuses on many different aspects of this issue, but Ms. Fihn chose to talk about the specific effects of a nuclear detonation on the economy and development. As in other areas, it is clear that the challenges are not limited to the concerned area but will have national, regional, and possibly global impact on the economy. In order to estimate the costs of a nuclear detonation, many different variables, such as the size of the bomb, the nature of the incident, and the location of the detonation have to be taken into account.

Ms. Fihn talked about three categories of economic impact: cost of destruction, cost of disruption, and reactionary costs. She stressed that we must not forget how different the world is today in comparison to when nuclear bombs were dropped over Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945, and argued that the economic effects would spread much more rapidly today. She concluded that being a non-nuclear weapon state or a part of a nuclear weapon free zone does not shield one from suffering the consequences of a nuclear detonation. She argued that since all states have the responsibility to protect their citizens against such threats, all governments should engage in this issue and commence work to outlaw and eliminate nuclear weapons.

Paul Eavis from the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) crisis prevention section focused on the social and economic impact of a nuclear detonation and the challenges to restore the lives and livelihood both in and around the directly affected area. He noted that while UNDP fortunately has no first-hand experience of a nuclear detonation, it has experience from nuclear contamination and its effects. He noted that the Chernobyl disaster and nuclear testing in Kazakhstan have showed how profound the long-term consequences for human development in the affected areas are. Mr. Eavis stated that no adequate response

capacity exists to deal with such a situation, and even less so in developing countries, which makes them particularly vulnerable. He also noted that developing countries would be discriminately affected from the impact that a nuclear detonation will have on food supply and food prices.

From Thomas Nash of Article 36 we heard encouraging words on how active civil society is and how the engagement of international humanitarian actors such as the ICRC has helped to create a new momentum on nuclear weapons. He focused on the way forward and argued that a new treaty banning nuclear weapons is needed. He believed it was possible to achieve such a treaty within the next few years, and argued a process towards this would help to end the unsustainable status quo. Mr. Nash argued that a future ban on nuclear weapons would fulfil already existing disarmament obligations, such as article VI of the NPT, and could build on the value of the existing nuclear weapon free zones.

The presentations were followed by an engaged discussion amongst the participants, and touched upon things like the importance of talking about nuclear weapons for what they really are: weapons with devastating consequences and not as some abstract symbol of power, value, and guarantee of security. The discussion also highlighted that a humanitarian perspective on nuclear weapons is not only relevant for nuclear disarmament but also for preventing proliferation.

The side event clearly highlighted the importance that NPT states parties and civil society place on this topic.





**News in Brief***Mia Gandenberger | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF***Cluster two specific issue****Egypt's walk-out**

- Chair took note of Egypt's delegation to leave the PrepCom and invited Egypt to retake its seat and engage in deliberations. He briefly postponed discussions on the MEWMDFZ issue to allow for that to happen. However, the Egyptian delegation remained absent.

**Middle East WMD free zone**

- Bahrain and Qatar called for the establishment of verification mechanisms to measure progress on convening the conference on a WMDFZ in the Middle East.
- Mexico welcomed plans for multilateral consultations.
- Bahrain suggested that preparatory meetings could finalize the agenda and establish a framework for the outcome of the WMDFZ conference.
- Algeria, Jordan, Lesotho said consultations and conference should not be the end goal but a start to a process.
- Malaysia regretted the lack of agenda, date, and venue for the consultations. It said such consultations must be under UN auspices, transparent, and sincere.
- Bahrain, Brazil, Germany, Greece, Indonesia, Italy, Jordan, Kuwait, Lesotho, Netherlands, Portugal, ROK, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Spain, Sudan, and Syria called for convening the conference in 2013.
- Qatar said called for the conference to be held before the next NPT PrepCom.
- Mauritania and New Zealand called for the rapid convening of the conference.
- Libya said the Arab states are open to preparatory meetings under UN auspices as soon as possible and before the end of 2013.

**Other regional issues**

- Japan and United States called on India and Pakistan to declare moratoria on production of fissile

materials and restrain their nuclear and missile programmes.

- The US declared that its nuclear activities with India and Pakistan continue to be consistent with its NPT obligations and its NSG commitments.
- ROK said recent declarations have been the first time the DPRK has openly described its uranium enrichment programme as being part of its nuclear weapons programme.
- Iran asked states to stop creating confrontations with NPT states parties and expressed concern about being mentioned together with the DPRK.
- Iran asked Japan to clarify whether or not it intends to acquire nuclear weapons, highlighting a declaration from a Tokyo official on this question.
- Japan said it is not aware of this declaration and said it is in compliance with the NPT.

*Illustration by Tim Wright, International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons*

## Cluster three

### Nuclear energy

- New Zealand reiterated its choice not to rely on nuclear energy.
- China announced that it has developed a long-term strategy for increasing its nuclear power capacity, saying it has the world's largest nuclear power fleet under construction.
- Russia said the Fukushima disaster affected the global position on the nuclear energy, yet many states continue to implement their plans for new reactors.
- Japan and US looked forward to the international ministerial conference on nuclear power in the 21st century in June 2013 in St. Petersburg.

### Fuel cycle

- Australia commended the Czech Republic and the IAEA on the recent announcement of their successful efforts to remove all HEU fuel from the Czech Republic.
- The UK announced the de-fueling of its last HEU-fuelled research reactor by early 2014.
- Russia reiterated its support for the International Uranium Enrichment Centre in Angarsk and welcomed Armenia and the Ukraine as members.
- South Africa announced it is producing medical isotopes using LEU instead of HEU.
- NAM, Japan, ROK, and US welcomed efforts towards multilateral approaches to the fuel cycle.
- Argentina expressed caution about such initiatives, which it worries could limit legitimate access to the nuclear fuel cycle based on proliferation concerns.

### Nuclear safety

- EU encouraged states to conduct a review of their nuclear facilities similar to the stress test it undertook on the European nuclear facilities.
- France suggested creating an international rapid reaction team in case of nuclear crisis.
- France and Russia said they have submitted proposals to the IAEA on nuclear safety.
- France called attention to the importance of implementing a global nuclear civil liability regime.
- Australia, France, Indonesia, ROK, Switzerland, and UK underlined the impact of the Fukushima

disaster on the re-evaluation of nuclear safety and revision of standard practices.

- Japan said that in September 2012 it founded a new independent nuclear regulatory authority.
- The EU, Indonesia, Japan, Philippines, Switzerland, and South Africa supported the implementation of the IAEA action plan on nuclear safety.
- New Zealand called for the IAEA action plan on nuclear safety to be a living document and updated on a regular basis.

### Nuclear security

- Australia called for creation of a regime beyond the Nuclear Security Summit process.
- EU, New Zealand, Japan, and South Africa welcomed IAEA high-level conference on nuclear security in Vienna in July 2013.
- France announced it will in December 2013 host together with the IAEA the first international conference devoted to lessons learned from the International Physical Protection Advisory Service hosted by France in April 2012. •

If only BOMBS didn't exist...





Illustration by Ryan Kelly, Wired.com

## 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: Switzerland	Room XVI	Reaching Critical Will
10:00-13:00	Plenary: Cluster three	Assembly Hall	
13:15-14:45	Creating the Conditions for General and Complete Disarmament	Room XVI	SCRAP
13:15-14:45	Regional nuclear material accountancy and control mechanisms, the European model	Assembly Hall	European Union and Euratom
13:15-14:45	UK plans to set-up new nuclear programme	Room XI	UK Department of Energy and Climate Change
15:00-18:00	Plenary: Cluster three specific issue (nuclear energy and other issues)	Assembly Hall	