



News In Review

A collection of NGO views on the NPT PrepCom 2002

April 15, 2002 - No. 6



UN Office: 777 UN Plaza, New York, NY 10017. ph. (212) 682-1265 * info@reachingcriticalwill.org * www.reachingcriticalwill.org
Int Secretariat: 1, rue de Varembe, C.P.28, 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland. Phone: (+41 22) 733-6175 E-mail: wilpf@iprolink.ch

One Week Down, One to Go

NGOs are pleased that the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Preparatory Committee Meeting will proceed this week after much deliberation among party states over the indicative timetable. "Taking note of" the timetable is usually one of the first procedural elements of a meeting such as the NPT, and is often determined prior to the commencement of the meeting. However, it took all five days of the first week and a threat of the indefinite suspension of the PrepCom if no agreement were made by today, to move things forward. Ironically, debates and discussions on issues of contention in the timetable that had not yet been approved continued to take place. Nevertheless, the PrepCom shall continue this week, beginning with a discussion of regional issues, most notably, the Middle East.

A major focus of the first week, of great concern to NGOs as expressed in the NGO presentation on reporting, was how to qualify the discussion on the requirement of "regular reporting", the 12th of the 13 practical steps agreed to at the 2000 NPT Review Conference. This concept appeared in various working papers of party states.

In the New Agenda Coalition's working paper, the need was expressed to "take stock of developments that have occurred since the 2000 Review Conference as well as to consider further measures to be taken in pursuit of our joint initiative to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world". This was qualified, stating that this PrepCom must "ensure that there is a proper accounting in the reports by States of their progress in achieving nuclear disarmament". In addition, the working paper of the Non-Aligned Movement firmly called for the "States Parties, in particular the Nuclear Weapon States, should submit reports to each PrepCom session, including this one. We

expect that the reports on Article VI should cover issues and principles addressed by the 13 steps and should include specific and complete information on each of these steps. These reports should also address, inter alia, current policies and intentions, as well as developments in these areas". The Canadian working paper focused entirely on this subject, stating that "effective reporting would enhance transparency and confidence in the Treaty, and provide baselines against which all States Parties could account for their implementation of the Treaty, and by which overall progress would be measured".

In this vein, several reports were submitted to the PrepCom in this first week. Unfortunately, since no standard format on reporting currently exists, there were several elements that were omitted by various states, or not reported in sufficient detail. Thirteen countries have submitted reports so far. One format of reporting, which was the most desirable, was on each of the ten articles of the NPT, by Canada and New Zealand. Another format was to report on selected elements of implementation of commitment to Article VI, such as Nuclear-Weapon-Free zones or national policy on nuclear disarmament, reported in a more vague and narrative fashion, employed by Australia, France, Indonesia, Mongolia, Poland, Sweden, and Thailand. The United States carefully chose its terminology, and called their report a "submission" of information, rather than a report.

Finally, Algeria, Australia, Egypt and Jordan reported on steps to promote the achievement of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East and the realization of the goal and objectives of the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East. The Egyptian report was the most specific one, outlining its efforts at the national, regional, and international level.

Continued next page...

News In Review is funded by Ploughshares Fund, The Ford Foundation & others

All articles contained in News In Review are the sole responsibility of the author or organisation submitting the pieces. The opinions herein are not necessarily those of the Editors, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) or the Reaching Critical Will project.

Cont...

The statements of the first week had a few recurring themes. The general tone of Non-Nuclear Weapons States (NNWS) presented concern of setbacks and lack of movement in many areas, as well as the need to "further strengthen the NPT, the main pillar of multilateral regimes which address the problems of WMD proliferation and disarmament" (Japan, April 8, 2002). All NNWS also mentioned the importance of the "unequivocal undertaking made by the nuclear weapons-states at the 2000 Review Conference" (Norway, April 8, 2002). All of the Nuclear Weapons States (NWS) mentioned the importance of strengthening the IAEA safeguards system, with the UK stating that "it should be an obligation for NPT parties to bring Additional Protocols into force" (UK, April 9, 2002). Commitment to Article VI was mentioned, but in vague terms, merely citing a few steps each country is taking towards nuclear disarmament. NGOs support the calls of the NNWS in demanding that efforts towards nuclear disarmament be accelerated in a transparent and verifiable manner, without delay.

The NGO presentations to the NPT party states on Wednesday, April 10 was the highlight for the NGOs last week. For an analysis of the themes, recommendations and responses to the presentations, see issue #4 of the News in Review, which can be found on-line at: <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/npt/NIR2002/nir4.pdf>. To view the presentations themselves, go to: <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/npt/ngostate2002.html>.

In the coming week NGOs hope that there will be less tensions hindering the necessary work of the NPT PrepCom. Rather, all 187 party states have come from all over the world to discuss how to rid the world of nuclear weapons. NGOs hope that this short period of two weeks will be used wisely and will provide a steppingstone towards the work of the next two PrepComs. As a result, NGOs hope that the 2005 Review Conference can implement some real measures which will speed up the momentum and strengthen efforts towards nuclear disarmament.

Emily Schroeder, Reaching Critical Will, WILPF



Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) Principles: Peace and Justice

- The equality of all people; An end to all forms of violence; and The transfer of resources from the military to human needs and debt relief
- World disarmament and the peaceful resolution of international conflict through the United Nations

To find out more about WILPF, see the following websites:

WILPF INT: www.wilpf.int.ch

WILPF UN: www.reachingcriticalwill.org and www.peacewomen.org

WILPF USA: www.wilpf.org



<http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org>

Reaching Critical Will



Quote of the Week

It is, of course, true that we no longer support some of the Article VI conclusions in the Final Document from the 2000 NPT Review Conference. A prominent example of this is the ABM Treaty. Another example of a treaty we no longer support is the CTBT. However, the United States generally agrees with the conclusions of the 2000 NPT Review Conference.

- Ambassador Javits, of the USA to the NPT PrepCom on April 11, 2002.

NATO has been a silent, yet important actor in the NPT review process due to its continued reliance on nuclear weapons as a part of its strategy. Progress will continue to be hampered in meeting the NPT's goals unless the Alliance and Alliance members play a more active role. NATO has indeed affirmed and reaffirmed its support for and commitment to the NPT and has cited changes made to the nuclear paragraphs of its Strategic Concepts from 1991 to 1999 as a demonstration of its commitment. However, the only significant changes were references made to nuclear reductions they have carried out and statements that nuclear forces 'continue to fulfil an essential role' in maintaining Alliance security.

NATO countries committed themselves to a 13-point action plan adopted at the 2000 NPT Review Conference. Has the Alliance made any progress? In order to assess NATO's activity regarding the NPT, this paper provides a chronology of NATO action on the 13 steps since the RevCon. The final Communiqués of the Foreign Ministers Meetings and the Defence Planning Committee and Nuclear Planning Group meetings were used as the basis for analysis. The steps (in quotations) are taken from the 2000 final document. All quotes on NATO action are taken from the Communiqués. Complete documentation can be found on the NATO website at: www.nato.int. For other information and regular reporting on NATO activities, visit the CESD website at: www.cesd.org.

1. Signing the CTBT. NATO Action: NATO has announced and reiterated its support for the CTBT. May 2000, '...Remain committed to an early entry into force of CTBT'. December 2000, 'NATO Allies continue to support the ratification, early entry into force, and full implementation of the CTBT'.

2. Stopping Testing. NATO Action: NATO has announced and reiterated its support for the moratorium. May, Dec 2000, 'We urge all states with nuclear capabilities to abide by a moratorium on nuclear weapon test explosions or any other nuclear explosions'. June 2001 'We urge all states to maintain existing moratoria on nuclear testing'. December 2001 'We continue to support the existing moratoria on nuclear testing'.

3. Negotiation on a Fissile Material Ban. NATO Action: NATO has not taken steps toward such negotiation. While it is not responsible for commencing such negotiations, it shares the blame for any lack of initiative on this treaty as it remains a high priority for most NATO member states.

4. Negotiation on Nuclear Disarmament. NATO Action: NATO has not taken steps toward supporting such negotiations.

5. Irreversibility. NATO Action: No action.

6. Abolishing Nuclear Weapons. NATO Action: NATO has repeatedly revealed its lack of commitment to this step. June, Dec 2000 'NATO's nuclear forces are a credible and effective element of the Allies' strategy of preventing war, and they are maintained at the minimum level sufficient to preserve peace and stability.

December 2001 'We emphasised again that nuclear forces based in Europe and committed to NATO continue to provide an essential political and military link between the European and North American members of the Alliance'.

7. Implementing Existing Treaties. NATO Action: NATO's commitment to supporting the ABM Treaty has been undermined by its plans for a Theatre Missile Defence system. Two feasibility studies were launched on 1 July 2001 with results due out on 31 December 2002, part of an ongoing programme to procure a NATO TMD. May, Dec 2000 'We reaffirm that the Alliance's defence posture must have the capability to address appropriately and effectively the risks associated with the proliferation of NBC weapons [through Theatre Missile Defence]'. May, Dec 2001 'We welcome continued work in NATO on Theatre Missile Defence'.

8. Implementing Existing Treaties. NATO Action: NATO has sought no role in such implementation.

9. Incremental Approach. NATO Action:

- December 2001 'Welcomed President Bush's decision to reduce over the next decade the number of US operationally deployed strategic nuclear weapons to between 1700-2200 and President Putin's statement that Russia intended to reduce its strategic nuclear weapons 'in kind'.

- June 2001 Announced its support for 'increased transparency with Russia on nuclear weapons matters on a reciprocal basis' in the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council.

- Dec 00, Jun 01 '...Recalled the drastic reductions of [its] nuclear forces in the new security environment and renewed [their] call on Russia to complete the reductions in its non-strategic nuclear weapons stockpile'.

- NATO does not seek a diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies or embrace the prospect of total elimination of nuclear weapons as outlined in the nuclear paragraphs of the Alliance's 1999 Strategic Concept (see Annex for complete text): 'The supreme guarantee of security of the Allies is provided by the strategic nuclear forces of the Alliance, particularly those of the United States.....they will be maintained at the minimum level sufficient to preserve peace and stability'.

10. Stopping the Production of Plutonium. NATO Action: NATO has announced its commitment to the Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty. May, June, Dec 2000 '...Committed to the immediate commencement of negotiations on, and the rapid conclusion of a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally and effectively verifiable and universal Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty'.

May 2001 '...Remain committed to the immediate commencement, in the Conference on Disarmament, of negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty'.

11. General and Complete Disarmament. NATO Action: No action.

12. Reporting. NATO Action: NATO makes no reports regarding the NPT outside of its ministerial Communiqués.

13. Verifying. NATO Action: NATO has taken no active steps toward such verification goals.

By Sarah Yeomans, Centre for European Disarmament and Security, <http://www.cesd.org>

What's On: WEEK TWO

* **NOTE CHANGE- Daily:** Abolition 2000 Morning Caucus, 9am , Monday-Friday, Conf Room D, United Nations.

Monday, April 15th, 2002

* "Sustainable Energy Fund: Ending the Toxic Legacy of the Nuclear Age: Health, Waste and Power", 1pm-3pm. Conference Room D. Facilitated by Global Resource Action Resource Center for the Environment (GRA CE)

* "The Nuclear Mystique", nuclear disarmament from the psychological perspective", 6pm-9pm, 777 UN Plaza, 11th Floor, Facilitated by Psychologists for Social Responsibility/ Committee on Global Violence and Security.

Tuesday, April 16th, 2002

* Presentation of the Alan Cranston Peace Award, 1:25-2:45pm. UN Conference Room 4/ Award presented to UN Under-Secretary General for Disarmament Affairs, by Jane Goodall. Facilitated by the Global Security Institute.

Wednesday, April 17th, 2002

* Youth Caucus". 1:15-2:45pm, UN Conference Room 4. A panel of young people will speak about the dangers of nuclear power, nuclear terrorism, and pose question to NWS delegates about their apparent failure to work towards nuclear disarmament. Facilitated by: Educators for Social Responsibility.

* "The Threat of Nuclear Terrorism". The possibilities and impact of nuclear terrorism, including attacks on power plants and 'dirty bombs', and approaches for security and prevention". 6:30pm- 8pm, 777 UN Plaza, 12th Floor. Facilitated by Physicians for Social Responsibility (PSR) and International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW).

Please check venue and times against daily schedule as these may change



B. Rawson@2002
freedomspice@earthlink.net