



# NEWS IN REVIEW

A Collection of NGO Views on the NPT PrepCom 2004

April 28, 2004 - No. 3



Women's International League for Peace and Freedom-

**UN Office:** 777 UN Plaza, 6th Floor, New York, NY 10017 Phone: (212) 682-1265 Fax: (212) 286-8211 Email: wilpfun@igc.org

**International Secretariat:** 1, rue de Varembe, C. P.28, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland Phone (+41 22) 919-7080 Fax: (+41 22) 919-7081 Email: info@wilpf.ch

## WHO'S MISSING THE MARK?

Decades of NPT conferences, CD and UNDC sessions, NGO access to- and participation in- disarmament fora still remains limited, at best. Non-governmental organizations that focus on other issues- i.e. human rights, environment, disabilities, etc.- enjoy substantively greater participation in the consultations of their governments than do their disarmament-focused compatriots, who remain either in the margins of the discussions or relegated to the hallways. The official justification behind this fettered access is that issues pertaining to nuclear weapons are highly sensitive, and that the opaque nature of these proceedings protects national security interests. Unofficial excuses, however, often include the perception that NGOs are not strategic, that they are ignorant of the diplomatic challenges that face the governments, or that, blindsided by idealism, they do not fully understand the issues at hand.

Yesterday, the PrepCom heard statements from a dozen States in the morning, followed by a two and a half hour session dedicated to NGO presentations, a small, hard-won opportunity that was granted to NPT watchers only a few years ago. After these sessions, those claiming that NGOs are missing the mark must have had their translators set to the wrong station.

Common themes, nay, often verbatim analysis, concerns, and suggestions were mutually reflected in many of the NGO and NNWS statements. The echoes of the NNWS' morning statements permeated the afternoon session of NGO statements, demonstrating that civil society knows not only what the priority issues are, but that they are also attuned to similar solutions sought by the NNWS.

Cuba's assertion that "Military doctrines based upon the possession of nuclear weapons are unsustainable and unacceptable," was substantiated acutely in the presentation entitled, "Vertical Proliferation," wherein Jackie Cabasso of the Western States Legal Foundation stated that "As the Nuclear Posture Review makes clear, nuclear weapons will be part of the US arsenal until at least 2070, the 100th anniversary of the NPT. This is

unacceptable." The Holy See was on the same wavelength as well: "It continues to be a discordant note in international relationships that some States, which profess ardent support for the NPT, are still attached to military policies which hold that nuclear weapon are essential as the supreme guarantee of security."

The Security Council resolution on nonproliferation was a topic of concern for both NGOs and the NNWS. While Cuba denounced it as an "initiative with dangerous consequences (that is) moving forward without the possibility for the great majority of States to participate in their drafting," the NGOs insisted that "the resolution is likely to be more effective if subsequent effort to extend the web of legislation controlling the spread of NBC weapons is achieved through negotiated international agreements in which all states may have their say."

Brazil could have been speaking for the NGOs as well when it declared that "In our view, the expression 'non-proliferation' contained in the Preamble is meant to apply both to the horizontal and the vertical aspects of proliferation." The NGOs dedicated two entire statements to these equally urgent problems; Jackie Cabasso of WSLF discussed vertical proliferation while Alice Slater of the Global Resource Action Center on the Environment addressed horizontal proliferation concerns.

The delayed entry-into-force of the CTBT remains a primary issue for many States and NGOs alike. Urgency of the treaty's entry-into-force was highlighted by the Caribbean Community, the Holy See and others, along with four NGO presentations: those delivered by Sarah Estabrooks of Project Ploughshares ("A Living Document: Reaffirming the 13 Steps") Alice Slater of GRACE ("Proliferation: Finding the Common Thread,"), Ron McCoy of IPPNW ("Human Tragedy of Proliferation and Nuclear Rearmament,"), and the Recommendations, which, due to time constraints, IPPNW's John Loretz did not orally deliver.

The NWS, on the other hand, pre- *continued on page 5*

## WHO'S WHO- PROFILE

John Loretz,  
Program Director of the International Physicians  
for the Prevention of Nuclear War

*What is important to you at this PrepCom?*

Well I think that IPPNW, like most of the other NGOs, has really sort of come to a sense over the last year or so that the whole process of disarmament is becoming unraveled and that we are really facing a more serious nuclear threat now than we have ever since the end of the cold war, and the nature of that threat is really the double standard that the Bush administration has put out for perpetual ownership of nuclear weapons by the United States but no ownership by any country that is seen to threaten the U.S. This is a recipe for proliferation and unless the U.S. is willing to live up to its obligations under the NPT and actually disarm along with the other NWS then proliferation can only continue at an increased pace.

As we look forward to the 2005 Review Conference, we realized as a federation that this is going to be a crossroads in the whole effort to get on the track of disarmament and that we have to be there participating as much as we can to make sure that at least the voice of civil society gets out there to establish the urgency and also to find allies within the non-nuclear weapons states who can start pushing the U.S. in a different direction.

*Tell us more about IPPNW.*

In 58 countries around the world we have medical organizations who work with IPPNW as affiliates. That's where the bulk of IPPNW's work is done, in those affiliate countries. Every affiliate is committed to the core mission of IPPNW which is the prevention of nuclear war and the elimination of nuclear weapons. The ones that probably work most strongly on nuclear issues are the European affiliates, and countries like Japan, Australia, and Canada. We have a very strong program in South Asia- India, Pakistan and Nepal affiliates in particular are working very hard on the nuclear crisis in that region of the world. It's really spread out everywhere.

*How long have you been working on these issues and what got you into it in the first place?*

I've been working on disarmament for going on 25 years now. I started in the very early 80s when I was taking a break from "real work" to write fiction. While I was busy writing fiction, which meant reading a lot of stuff, I started reading things like Jonathan Schell's "Fate of the Earth" in New Yorker magazine when it first came out,

started paying attention to things like Three Mile Island, and when Reagan got elected and with the heightening of the cold war tensions, I thought, what am I doing sitting here writing these silly little short stories that are not going to get published, let alone read by anybody, when there's going to be nobody left to read them. So I started looking around locally for anyone working on nuclear weapons problems and ended up being communications director at Women's Action for Nuclear Disarmament for 3 or 4 years, then went to Physicians for Social Responsibility in DC for another 4 or 5 years as their communications director, continued as the editor of Medicine for Global Survival for another 7 or 8 years and here I am at IPPNW as program director, sort of slowly realizing I'm in this for life, and there's no getting out of it. I think that once you understand what's really at stake and how responsible we all need to be for it, it gets in your blood. Everyone I know who has been doing this for as long as I have, or longer, would never stop doing it.

*What's your advice to young people who are getting started in this work?*

The medical students that work with IPPNW have taken matters into their own hands which are great. They have organized a project called the Nuclear Weapons Inheritance project... they said look, we are going to be inheriting these weapons and the nuclear policies of our countries and we have to decide what we want to do about that, and how we're going to change it and how we're going to behave when it's our turn to run the governments and be in the leadership positions. One of the things we've been grappling about at IPPNW is the amnesiac effect of time and that as much as we've gone out there talking about the medical and environmental consequences of nuclear war over the years, people are forgetting that now. It's kind of old information that we take for granted, but that a lot of younger people just don't have. They know that nuclear weapons are a really bad thing but what are the real medical consequences. Well the medical students are going out and teaching their colleagues, their peers in medical schools all over the world what the environmental and medical consequences of nuclear weapons are and they're recruiting their peers to get involved and join in this movement. We can trust younger people to take responsibility for this and they'll do it, once they start to learn they'll do it. Seeing signs that younger people are going to carry on this work is really really important to me.

*Learn more about John and IPPNW on their website:*  
<http://www.ippnw.org>

## NUCLEAR SHARING UNDER THE “SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP” UMBRELLA

- Nigel Chamberlain, *BASIC*

Despite his administration's antipathy toward international treaties, President Bush is preparing to sign a bilateral agreement with minimal fanfare and limited oversight, unless Congress decides otherwise.

Here in London, the Labour government has shown every indication that it would prefer to avoid any serious debate in Parliament on this issue. This despite the critical need to publicly examine all bilateral nuclear issues, especially those that might promote, rather than curtail, global nuclear proliferation.

Members of the Blair government would argue that the security provisions in the agreement are so strong that no foreign power would have access to new information. Nonetheless, the agreement is, in itself, a form of proliferation.

On May 23, 1994, President Bill Clinton transmitted to Congress the amended 1958 U.S.-UK agreement for “Cooperation on the Uses of Atomic Energy for Mutual Defense Purposes.”

This amendment to the 1958 Agreement extends to the end of this year, by which time it must be renewed in London and Washington, or fall. While highly motivated to prevent the spread of nuclear materials that might find their way into weapons programs across most of the world, the United States permits Britain access to scientific information, technology and materials “to continue to maintain viable nuclear forces” in this near open-ended agreement.

When Mr. Bush transmits his approval and recommendation to congress, representatives and senators have 60 days to formally raise their concerns or challenge the basis of the agreement. If no voice is raised in that period, the 1958 U.S.-U.K. Mutual Defense Agreement is deemed ratified until 2014 and will not be revisited until then.

In terms of costs to the United States, there is the money spent to service the Joint Atomic Information Exchange Group in the Defense Nuclear Agency Headquarters, plus those incurred by the joint working groups and the cost of “Exchange of Information by Visits and Reports” to facilitate face-to-face meetings between scientist and military personnel. But the full and actual costs remain in planned obscurity, as do the arrangements for exchanging nuclear materials and related components. For instance, it is understood that barter arrangements like the transfer of U.S. highly enriched uranium in return for U.K. plutonium may mean that both countries can maintain the dubious answer of “nil cost” when questioned.

Is it legal? According to successive administrations since its original signing in 1958, the Mutual Defence Agreement was legitimized by an amendment to the 1954 Atomic Energy Act and “meets all statutory requirements”.

While this active and extensive assistance to the U.K. allows Britain to maintain its Trident nuclear weapons system may be deemed legal by domestic law, it is certainly highly questionable under international law. Article 1 of the Non-Proliferation Treaty was written to prevent those states already in possession of nuclear weapons (at the time of its signing in 1968) from sharing that knowledge and capability.

From the start, the United States and Britain chose to exclude their nuclear sharing arrangement from scrutiny under the NPT; they either offered a different interpretation of their obligations or ignored criticism altogether.

To this day, the legality issue remains unresolved, but there can be no doubt that the Mutual Defense Agreement subverts the spirit and objectives of the NPT. In turn, the continued obduracy of the two nuclear weapon states has not gone unnoticed internationally and, at best, this has contributed to the stagnation at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. At worst, this determination to remain a nuclear power indefinitely is rightly deemed hypocritical and used by aspiring nuclear weapon states to justify their own “pursuit of greatness” via unofficial membership of the nuclear club.

The British Government has recently indicated that any decision to replace its four Trident submarines with another nuclear delivery system will have to be made in the next parliament after a general election in 2005. No mention was made of what Britain needs to do to comply with its own obligations under Article VI the NPT.

The Bush administration is currently engaged in a vigorous campaign to curb horizontal nuclear proliferation worldwide, rightly so in the opinion of many commentators. But should Washington, at the same time, be actively promoting vertical nuclear proliferation at home and in selected countries abroad just when the signatory nations to the Non-Proliferation Treaty are making plans to meet for their conference in New York later this month?

Or will members of the U.S. Congress and the British Parliament assert their representative rights and bring the executives of both countries to account?

*This article originally appeared in Global Beat Syndicate, April 19, 2004, and is reprinted here by permission of the author.*

# The Toxic Legacy of the Nuclear Age

- John Loretz, IPPNW

The medical consequences of exposure to low doses of ionizing radiation, the dangers of plutonium reprocessing in Japan, and the devastation caused to indigenous peoples by the testing and production of nuclear weapons were the subjects of a forum presented by Abolition 2000 on day two of the 2004 NPT PrepCom. The Toxic Legacy of the Nuclear Age: Proliferation, Waste, Health, and Sustainable Energy was moderated by Alice Slater of GRACE. Speakers included Ingo Bonde of the German affiliate of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW), Satomi Oba of Plutonium Action Hiroshima, and Motarilavao Hilda Lini of the Nuclear Free and Independent Pacific Movement.

Dr. Bonde reviewed medical studies documenting that there is no safe dose threshold for exposures to radiation, and added that nuclear energy and nuclear weapons are two sides of the same coin. "Let's get rid of the whole coin," he concluded. Ms. Oba noted that Japan is the only country that "still pursues the dream of endless energy from plutonium," and referred to the worldwide concern regarding Japan's potential to acquire nuclear weapons. PAH is calling for the total cessation of all plutonium reprocessing.

Ms. Lini concluded the presentations by noting that 2004 marks 50 years of US nuclear testing in the Pacific. The damage continues since local governments are bought off with promises of development aid in exchange for sacrificing their land to nuclear waste depositories. Noting that indigenous people have always believed that peace is central to human security, Ms. Lini pleaded, "Let the experiences of indigenous people who have lived with radiation be a lesson for all of us."

## TODAY at the PrepCom!

**At 9 AM,** the Mexican delegation will be briefing the NGOs in Conference Room A in an off-the-record session.

**At 10 AM,** WILPF will be hosting a panel on the "Military Corporate Connection" in Conference Room A.

**At 1 PM,** Abolition 2000, Coalition for Nuclear Disarmament UK, Stop Essais and Mouvement de la Paix will hold a workshop: "What could be a European Initiative for Nuclear Disarmament?" in Conference Room A.

**At 1:15 PM** Physicians for Social Responsibility will host a panel "Counterproliferation and the Future of the Nonproliferation Treaty" in Conference Room 5.

**At 3 PM,** Peace Depot and Civil Network for a Peaceful Korea will hold a workshop: "Northeast Asia Nuclear Weapon Free Zone" in Conference Room A.

**At 3 PM,** Nuclear Age Peace Foundation will hold a panel: "Nuclear Weapons, Nonproliferation and the Quest for Security" in Conference Room 10.

**At 6:30 PM,** the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) will host a reception celebrating our 89th Anniversary. It will be held on the second floor of the Church Center for the United Nations (777 UN Plaza), all are invited to attend.

## QUOTE OF THE DAY

"There is an attempt to substitute disarmament with non-horizontal proliferation issues. It is about imposing the approach of non-proliferation as an objective itself, when it should actually be viewed as a contribution in the efforts to achieve the final objective of disarmament."

- H.E. Orlando Requeijo Gual, Head of the Cuban Delegation.

dictably did not reflect the concerns, questions, and priorities that saturated the statements of the NGOs and the NNWS. France, for instance, delivered a rather lengthy commentary that discussed the horizontal challenges that have been overcome (Iraq, Libya), or that are currently being addressed (Iran), via the NPT.

While the NNWS and the NGOs expressed their sincere concern with the very real possibility of terrorist acquisition of NBC weapons, the "nuclear haves" and the "nuclear have nots" view the situation differently. Terrorism to Russia, for instance, is "the greatest threat" of all, which demands priority over other issues, including disarmament. The NNWS on the other hand, remain convinced that the terrorist threat highlights the pressing need for the complete elimination of all nuclear arsenals. As stated by Caricom, "While the international community has recently turned its attention to the very real danger of the acquisition and use of nuclear weapons by non-state actors, including terrorists, Caricom would stress that this should not detract from our agreed goal of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation."

The U.S., so often alone in its positions (as the General Assembly First Committee voting records will show), sent a high-level State Department official to summarize U.S. President Bush's non-proliferation proposals that were originally announced on February 11, rather than address the concerns, questions, and priorities that have been vocalized by its colleagues. The U.S. also used its time on the floor to verbally attack Iran and North Korea, prompting an impromptu defensive response from the Islamic Republic. This sort of intervention does nothing in the way of reaching agreement on the substantive and procedural recommendations that the PrepCom is to create. Rather, it contributes to the hostile political environment that has paralyzed movement on the many challenges facing the international community.

France offered only a weak response to the charges levied against the Proliferation Security Initiative, stating that the PSI "is consistent with national legal authorities and relevant international law and frameworks." The NWS- sponsors of the SC resolution- took time to voice their support for the resolution (which is scheduled to be adopted today), but did not address the many concerns broached by Cuba, the NGOs, and others. Mr. Bolton said simply, "Once it is passed, we are prepared to assist other governments in drafting and enforcing the new laws that will help stem WMD proliferation," an offering actually codified in the resolution in operative paragraph 5.

So is it, then, the NGOs' "ignorance of the issues" that justifies our continued exclusion? Is it the falsely perceived inability to grasp the nuances of diplomacy that warrant such limited access? Or is it the fear that civil society's support for the priorities of the majority of NNWS is the missing link to the critical will necessary to demand real action?

- Rhianna Tyson, Reaching Critical Will

## Pop Quiz: NGO or State Party?

*NGOs and States Parties often see eye-to-eye on many issues. See if you can guess who said the following statements- an NGO or a State Party. Give yourself one point for each correct answer. Give yourself five extra points for guessing the correct State Party or naming the correct NGO presentation. Answers will be available in tomorrow's News in Review.*

- 1) "Verification is not enough. The most air-tight verification regime in the world is worthless if confirmed violations are ignored."
- 2) "After all, the Treaty can only be as strong as our will to insist that states comply with it."
- 3) "An abject lack of political will to pursue disarmament, paired with an obsession with perceived proliferation threats, has tipped the balance of the NPT agreement away from the real threat to our world: the 30,000 nuclear weapons held by a handful of states, which, until they are eliminated, guarantee continued instability rather than 'undiminished security for all.'"
- 4) "News is revealed of technology developed within a country, or stolen, or sold, either openly or covertly, by nations, or by a whole network of black market nuclear suppliers...a frightening scenario of nuclear proliferation run rampant."
- 5) "We stand for a balanced approach to the PrepCom work. We would not like to see undue focus on some issues, although quite important, at the expense of others."
- 6) "In our view, the expression 'non-proliferation' contained in the Preamble is meant to apply both to the horizontal and the vertical aspect of proliferation."
- 7) "Those actively breaking the rules should not be entrusted with enforcing the rules."
- 8) "The PSI reflects an evolving and welcome understanding of the NBC weapon threat. In essence, it regards NBC weapon related shipments as contraband."
- 9) "The nuclear bomb represents a danger to the country which has them."

# Counterproliferation Policy and the future of the Nonproliferation Treaty

Experts Briefing for Delegates and NGO Representatives to the NPT Review Conference Preparatory Committee Meeting

## Speakers:

**Amb. Thomas Graham Jr., Lawyers Alliance for World Security**  
**Martin Butcher, Physicians for Social Responsibility**

**When:** April 28, 2004 1:15-2:45 pm

**Where:** U.N. Conference Room 5

Sponsored by:

**PSR**

® 1875 Connecticut Ave., N.W. Suite 1012  
Washington, D.C. 20009  
ph: (202) 667-4260 fx: (202) 667-4201  
[www.psr.org](http://www.psr.org)