At What Cost Agreement?

- Rhianna Tyson, WILPF

With his hand almost constantly clutched to his face, President Duarte looks a bit worried. His right-hand man, Jandyr Ferreira dos Santos, scurrying from consultation to consultation, looks a bit harried. Can you blame them?

Four days into the Review Conference (and after a year of global consultations), agreement on an agenda has still not been reached.

The Main Committees have not yet begun, as they were preliminarily scheduled to do on Wednesday. New York-based diplomats are wondering whether their colleagues in their capitols should even bother to come to New York at all, since nobody knows when, or if, substantive work will ever commence.

While the General Debate meanders on, with States expressing various levels of support for key unresolved issues such as negative security assurances, the nuclear fuel cycle, the CTBT, NGO participation, a FMCT and other important measures to strengthen the nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament regime, the diplomatic power team from Brazil continues to sandpaper the rough edges of disagreement in attempts to obtain that ever elusive goal: consensus on a program of work.

We hear they’re almost there. Though by the close of the session on Thursday, still no official word on agreement has been given.

The main point of contention thus far has focused on how to reference the Final Documents of past Review Conferences, or whether to mention them at all, since the US has been loathe to mention the historic agreement of 2000.

With so much disagreement over this point (referred to in the savvy diplomatic circles as paragraph 16), other important procedural points of contention—such as whether to establish subsidiary bodies on issues like negative security assurances and the Middle East—are seemingly abandoned in the Conference’s collective exhaustion.

So what will this highly anticipated agenda look like? Will the 2000 Final Document, and the 13 Steps contained within it, be excluded all together? Will States parties have given up the struggle to ensure that past hard-won agreements focus and direct future negotiations? Will enough time be spent on critical issues of the Treaty, without subsidiary bodies established to focus the diplomats’ attention on them?

One thing should remain clear, however. If the agenda is a watered-down version of the type of framework that would have best guided this Conference, were States parties and NGOs alike must not allow a vague agenda to portend a similarly vague Final Document.

At some point, we must collectively ask ourselves: at what cost agreement? At what point does negotiation devolve into capitulation, all in the name of agreement?

If language specific references to crucial disarmament agreements are indeed dropped, we must redouble our efforts to ensure that the agreement of 2005 is one of our strongest, and most accountable yet.
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Mayors at the United Nations

- Gillian Gilhool, WILPF US

Citizens around the globe working together to eliminate all nuclear weapons have banded together in an “Emergency Campaign to Ban Nuclear Weapons” by 2020, led by Mayors for Peace, other global associations of local authorities and supporting NGOs.

Over 1000 cities around the world have joined the mobilization. Mayors from 23 countries making up a delegation of 100 presented International Mayoral Statements and Public Petitions in the Great Hall of the General Assembly Wednesday.

Hiroshima Mayor Tadatoshi Akiba, President of Mayors for Peace, and Nagasaki Mayor Iccho Itoh of Nagasaki, Vice President, presided at the Tuesday morning session at The Japan Society, co-organized with Sister Cities International. The special threat to cities around the world was described with chilling facts. Dr. Charles Meade’s presentation of the Rand Corporation’s study of the local impacts around globe of a single terrorist nuclear attack, for example on the Port of Long Beach, was followed by Dr. Bruce Blair’s recitation of the minute-by-minute hair-trigger alert status of “launch on warning” systems of the United States and Russia. Thousands of nuclear warheads, 100,000 times the Hiroshima bomb equivalent, are still targeted at thousands of cities, the same rote script for a catastrophic unleashing of nuclear holocaust unchanged for 30 years.

This week, Secretary General Kofi Annan hailed Mayors for Peace in appreciation for amplifying citizens’ insistence that governments act boldly to achieve nuclear abolition.

What’s On: Today’s Calendar of Events (and this weekend!)

Daily morning interfaith prayer vigil
Where: Ralph Bunche Park, 42nd Street, 1st Avenue
When: May 2-6, 7:30 AM
Contact: Caroline Gilbert, Christian Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament

Abolition 2000 Morning Caucus
Where: United Nations Church Center (44th street and 1st avenue), Boss Room, 8th floor
When: Daily, 8 AM - 9 AM
Contact: Monika Szymurska, Global Coordinator

Governmental Briefing- Ambassador Sergio Q. Duarte, President of the Review Conference- RESCHEDULED FOR NEXT WEEK

German Youth Meeting
Where: UN Conference Room E
When: 10-11 AM
Contact: Felix Dania, felix_dania@hotmail.com

What Now for WILPF and Nuclear Weapons Abolition?
Where: UNCC, 2nd floor
When: 10-11 AM
Contact: Carol Reilley Urner, WILPF-US

Youth Forum for a Nuclear-Free World
Where: UN Conference Room E
When: 11:15 AM- 1:15 PM
Contact: Julia Kramer, Press Hut Mutlangen, Germany

German NGO Caucus Meeting
Where: CCUN, Drew Room
When: 1pm

Which European strategy for Nuclear Disarmament?
Where: UN Conference Room E
When: 1:15- 2:45
Contact: Dominique Lalanne, Abolition2000-Europe

Beyond the NPT - Towards the Nuclear-Weapons-Free World
Where: UN Conference Room E
When: 2:45-5:00 pm
Contact: Regina Hagen, INESAP

Abolition2000-Europe General Meeting
Where: United Nations Church Center (44th street and 1st avenue), 8th floor 777 UN Plaza (44th street and 1st ave)
When: 5:00-7:00 pm,
Contact: Dominique Lalanne, Abolition2000-Europe

WILPF 90th Anniversary Party
Where: UN Church Center, 2nd floor
When: 7- 10 PM

Contact: Susi Snyder, WILPF
ALL ARE INVITED!

Saturday, May 7

Abolition 2000 General Annual Meeting/ 10th anniversary celebration
Where: New School University
When: 10AM-5:00PM
Contact: Monika Szymurska, Abolition 2000 or (212) 726-9161

Panel on Disarmament and International Security
Where: Mariapolis Luminosa, 200 Cardinal Rd, Hyde Park, NY
When: 10 AM – Noon
Contact: Joe Klock, New Humanity of the Focolare Movement

Annual Luminosa Award for Unity to Senator Douglas Roche
Where: Mariapolis Luminosa, 200 Cardinal Rd, Hyde Park, NY
When: 2 PM – 4 PM
Contact: Joe Klock, New Humanity of the Focolare Movement

For the most recent Calendar of Events, see: www.reachingcriticalwill.org/legal/npt/RevConEvents.html
How Important is the CTBT?

-Jozef Goldblat

Unlike the 1963 Partial Test Ban Treaty (PTBT), which prohibits nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), signed in 1996, prohibits any nuclear explosion at any place. However, the CTBT is not yet in force. It may become effective only after the deposit of instruments of ratification by 44 states operating nuclear power or research reactors. So far, no more than three states possessing nuclear weapons — France, Great Britain and Russia — have ratified the treaty. China pledged to ratify the CTBT a few years ago, but has not yet done so, whereas the United States has rejected the treaty altogether. The moratoria on nuclear testing proclaimed by some of the signatories are not legally binding and may be abandoned at any time.

If an emerging nuclear-weapon state decides to test a newly developed nuclear device, it may do so chiefly to demonstrate that it has acquired a workable nuclear weapon and claim special international status. This is what has happened with India and Pakistan. When a nuclear-weapon power conducts test explosions, it does so primarily to validate modifications in the existing designs of nuclear warheads. The main purposes of these — often sophisticated — modifications are to achieve greater efficiency in the use of fissionable and fusible material and to increase the yield-to-weight ratio. The modifications may make the weapon assembly compatible with missiles and other means of delivery, as required by current military needs. Simulation with supercomputers cannot meet all these objectives. Warheads of designs not tested through explosions are not deemed sufficiently reliable to be deployed. Technical experts and military establishments of the nuclear-weapon powers consider it indispensable to have at least one explosion of a new or significantly re-designed warhead at or near full yield.

Testing is needed not only to modernize the first two generations of nuclear weapons — the fission and fusion explosive devices — but also to develop new and third-generation nuclear weapons. The latter constitute a refinement of the techniques involved in fission/fusion processes for the purpose of achieving special weapon effects, such as enhanced electromagnetic pulse or enhanced radiation. Cessation of nuclear testing will therefore bring to a halt substantial qualitative improvements of nuclear weapons. The CTBT will make it very unlikely that something completely new and exotic will emerge in the nuclear field.

Critics of the CTBT, predominantly in the United States, have held explosive testing to be necessary for maintaining the reliability, safety and security of their nuclear warheads. Today, however, the reliability of nuclear warheads can be ensured by visual and electronic examination of warheads disassembled in the course of routine maintenance operations and possible correction or replacement of faulty components. The tests conducted so far have ensured an adequate degree of safety of US nuclear weapons and the security is provided by the so-called permissive action links (PALs) that permit the use of nuclear weapons only by authorised personnel.

Still other critics of the CTBT want to test new small, low-yield tactical nuclear weapons and weapons that are more suitable for the destruction of deep, hardened underground facilities. To them, questions of reliability, safety, security may serve as pretexts for the resumption of nuclear test explosions. For the cause of inhibiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the CTBT does not carry the same significance now as it would have carried in the early years of the nuclear age. Today, any state with an indigenous modern technological base and/or the ability to buy the necessary technology can manufacture, without testing, a fission atomic device of a relatively simple design (although of uncertain yield), with a high degree of confidence that the device will work. Thermonuclear devices are more complicated. Developing them without testing would be very difficult, though not impossible. However, there can be no certainty that such non-tested devices will function as envisaged.

In any event, the CTBT will act to constrain nuclear proliferation. By imposing the same prohibition on testing on all parties, it will lessen the asymmetry between the rights and obligations of the nuclear “haves” and the rights and obligations of the nuclear “have nots”.

Jozef Goldblat is Vice-President of the Geneva International Peace Research Institute (GIPRI).

To enter-into-force, the CTBT requires the ratification by 44 States identified as having significant nuclear capabilities. Of these 44 States, listed in Annex II to the Treaty, the following States have still not ratified:

- China
- Colombia
- Democratic People’s Republic of Korea*
- India*
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Pakistan*
- United States
- Vietnam

*Indicates States which have not yet signed
Kristin Dedmon, WILPF

What to do with nuclear waste? Well, the US Department of Defense (DoD) uses their large stockpile of radioactive waste to make depleted uranium (DU) bullets, which they have been producing for the past 25 years.

At a workshop on May 3 on DU, organized by the Military Toxins Project, 11 speakers unanimously condemned the US military for the use of DU on the battlefield. These weapons, they asserted, which are both radioactive and chemically toxic, cause environmental and human health damage, despite assertions by the Pentagon to the contrary.

The military regards this ammunition as “effective” in that it “adds extra protection to tanks and ammunition” and “cuts easily through targets,” said Gulf War veteran Melissa Sterry, whose healthy external appearance masks the deadly radioactive laying waste to her insides. “The problem with DU,” she continued, “is that (the) particles can stay in your bones for 4.5 billion years.”

While most of the DU is secreted from the human body after ingestion, significant amounts remain in the kidneys and bones and, to a lesser extent, in other tissues, including the muscle, lung, brain, lymph nodes, and testes. This internal radiation source has been linked to health problems, including increased rates of cancer, birth defects, brain lesions, depressed immune systems and damage to skin, respiratory and digestive tracts.

Several panelists, including Scottish MP Chris Balance, highlighted the ways in which DU affects innocent civilians. Representatives for Grassroots Actions for Peace spoke about a local nuclear plant that had secretly dumped toxic residue into an unlined pit, which lies a quarter of a mile away from the river, contaminating the main water resource used by the nearby community as a main water resource.

The dangers of DU are exacerbated in the lack of research on these weapons or treatments for their victims. Dr. Rosalie Bertell, Former President of the International Institute for Concerns for Public Health (IICPH), discussed the bitter disputes between researchers who study radiation exposure in uranium mines, hospitals or laboratories, and those who experience the real world exposures of these weapons, such as down winders and Gulf War Veterans. With disparate research undertaken in two separate fields, not enough is being done to find treatments for these atomic veterans.

Currently, Japan is the only country that has extensive knowledge on how to treat DU victims. The US DoD has consistently denigrated public concern about the health and environmental consequences of DU. US Gulf War veterans have been denied health care and disability benefits because of the Pentagon’s denial of any possible link between DU exposure and health problems. Additional research, including rapid independent health screening of military personnel exposed to DU, is still needed, along with treatment and compensation for those effects.

Tara Thornton of the Military Toxins Project pointed out that a subcommittee of the UN Human Rights Commission considers DU munitions to be “weapons of mass destruction or with indiscriminate effect” and are incompatible with international humanitarian law.

The daughter of a Hiroshima survivor concluded the workshop by declaring, “No more Hiroshima. No more Nagasaki. No more Hibakusha. No more war.”
Comment on the Dutch Parliament
-Karel Koster, PNN-NL

The NPT Review Conference was debated in a number of parliaments last month. In the Netherlands parliament, for example, on 27 April, the Foreign Affairs Committee discussed the position the government would take at the NPT Review. After being questioned about this by opposition parliamentarians, Foreign Minister Bot gave two important hints: proliferation was the government’s main concern—implying that nuclear disarmament is of secondary importance—and that the government would be coordinating its position with the EU.

Minister Bot maintained this position despite suggestions by parliamentarians to focus on the New Agenda Coalition. After all, the Netherlands had voted for the NAC resolution only last autumn. Both choices were disconcerting; the EU position is necessarily a weak one on disarmament, because of the participation of the two Nuclear Weapon States, UK and France. The text of the EU position was not itself debated, although it had already been agreed on as of 25 March.

On the question of US nuclear weapons still deployed on Dutch soil, the Minister did make a small concession; he promised to look into the ramifications of the withdrawal of the NATO nuclear bombs from Greece in 2001. As one parliamentarian pointed out, there is a clear precedent for the withdrawal of NATO nuclear weapons. If Greece could do this (as Canada has before), then why not the Netherlands? Through his reply, the Minister tacitly accepted that nuclear weapons had indeed been deployed in Greece. That, of course, clashes with standard NATO policy: no confirmation or denial of the presence of nuclear weapons.

It is unfortunate that Foreign Minister Bot chose to make these two key positions public before the start of the NPT Review Conference. This, in effect, makes a shift toward a better position on disarmament during the negotiations which will no doubt take place these coming weeks impossible.

Karel Koster is the Director of the Project on Nuclear Non-Proliferation in the Netherlands.
In conjunction with the month long Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference the UN is presenting The Tony Price Atomic Art Exhibition in the South Gallery of the Visitors Lobby. The show opened to the public on May 2, 2005 and runs till June 9th.

The exhibition includes 19 sculptures as well as photographs, panel text, and video about artist Tony Price and his work. The featured works consist primarily of masks and wall-pieces created during the period between 1985 and 1999, and although they represent only a small portion of Price's total body of Atomic Art, these works provide an important insight into the artist's philosophy and the significance of his work.

The visitor to the exhibition will have the opportunity to see artworks created from the components of our nation's nuclear weapons program. For more than 30 years Price beat swords into plowshares, transforming the components from the nuclear weapons programs at Los Alamos National Laboratories, the birthplace of the atomic bomb, into assemblages to awaken people to the nuclear threat.

“Los Alamos to me was finding a place of just pure raw materials and fantastically, beautifully shaped metals. I found it a perfect mountain of art to experiment with, to create with and I go out looking for specific parts and sometimes there it'd be right there just as if hundreds of men had machined these things for hundreds of hours and carted it out and dumped it right there in front of my feet,” said Price.

On the opening day of the NPT Greenpeace dumped a 6 meter high nuclear bomb with the Statue of Liberty breaking out of it in the middle of the street outside the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Their demand was simple - get rid of NATO nuclear weapons from Germany and the rest of the world. It took four hours and two large cranes to remove it and the twenty five activists involved.

Leading German politicians in Germany agreed with the Greenpeace demand. “The nuclear weapons still housed in Germany are a relic from the Cold War,” said leader of the Green Party Claudia Roth in Monday’s Berliner Zeitung newspaper. “There is no need for them to be there. They should be removed and destroyed.”

Social Democrat Gert Weisskirchen from the German foreign ministry and Liberal Democrat leader Guido Westerwelle echoed the call for the missiles, mostly based at the Ramstein and Büchel air bases, to be removed. The removal of the missiles would "add credibility and strengthen negotiations with other countries," Westerwelle said.

Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer of Germany seemed to agree when speaking at the NPT RevCon opening debate on Monday when he admitted that there was indeed a "serious public debate on this issue which calls for practical steps..." He also said in his speech that: "We should re-examine the existing arsenals of strategic and sub-strategic nuclear weapons and energetically work to further reduce them. I therefore most strongly argue that this opportunity should not be wasted. What we need now is new impetus for nuclear disarmament..." And that it was Germany's aim "to reduce sub-strategic nuclear weapons - with the ultimate goal of their complete elimination." So Germany we are waiting for these fine words to be turned into action and as a first step we expect that Germany will publicly announce its intent to withdraw at least those nuclear weapons assigned to German aircraft and pilots from Büchel and Ramstein air bases.

William Peden is a Disarmament Researcher with Greenpeace International.

See more Tony Price atomic art at: http://newartsweb.com/atomicartist/