Tuesday passed with still no agreement on the agenda for this year's NPT PrepCom. Chairman Amano is continuing to consult, he said “with a view to ensuring support for the agenda that [he] proposed. Iran is worried that adopting an agenda that includes considering “compliance” will formalize the discussions about its nuclear programme and increase the possibility that something ends up in the factual summary of the meeting. It still looks like Iran will be alone in blocking the agenda, so Iran needs to decide if unilaterally opposing agreement in a multilateral disarmament forum is more or less costly than the possibility of censure in the factual summary.

Meanwhile, the PrepCom has continued with its General Debate, in which states are assessing the current state of disarmament and non-proliferation and proposing solutions. Throughout the General Debate, states have emphasized the importance of upholding and building on the commitments made to nuclear disarmament at the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences, especially the creation of a Middle East Nuclear Weapon Free Zone (1995) and the 13 Practical Steps (2000) to measure the implementation of Article VI obligations. As Ireland said on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition, it is time to build on previous commitments and move forward. Ireland suggested that nuclear weapon states publish the contents and status of their nuclear arsenals. Such a transparency measure would not only build confidence and “act as the baseline for nuclear disarmament”, it would prevent nuclear weapon states from disingenuous disarmament claims about dismantling warheads that have been in storage for 20 years. Because Reaching Critical Will agrees that determining what weapons are where will be the first step in a comprehensive global disarmament program, we put out a Model Nuclear Inventory every year. We hope this PrepCom will hold discussions on how to institutionalize and formalize this reporting requirement, which was agreed to in 2000.

On Monday, Costa Rica announced that it would be introducing an updated model nuclear weapons convention as an NPT document. The model convention was developed by international lawyers, disarmament experts and activists, and is part of the continuing trend of fruitful cooperation between NGOs and like-minded governments. Costa Rica originally introduced the convention to the General Assembly in 1997. The International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, the International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation, and the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms have updated the arguments for the viability of a nuclear weapons convention in their publication Securing our Survival: the Case for a Nuclear Weapons Convention, launched on Monday. Malaysia happily noted this in its Tuesday statement. A nuclear weapons convention should be discussed in this PrepCom as a way to forge the new disarmament consensus we seek.

States also recalled the prohibition against nuclear cooperation with states that are not members of the NPT. Some of these statements are clearly complaints about states that have nuclear cooperation with Israel, but the majority were referring to the proposed US-India deal. States parties to the NPT should prevent this proposal from undermining the premise of the NPT, and call on the Nuclear Suppliers Group to do so as well.

There is a great deal to discuss at this PrepCom, and much to be done in this Review Cycle. A half dozen governments have announced that they will submit working papers this PrepCom, and NGOs have books of solutions. Governments need to agree on the agenda today so the work can begin.
In June 2006, the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission released their report; Weapons of Terror. The book Nuclear Disorder or Cooperative Security? U.S. Weapons of terror, the Global Proliferation Crisis, and Paths to Peace, is a review and analysis of the WMD Commission’s report and recommendations. The book is a collaboration between Lawyers’ Committee on Nuclear Policy (LCNP), Western States Legal Foundation (WSLF) and the Reaching Critical Will project of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF). The book was launched on Tuesday when the primary authors described the book’s findings and recommendations.

John Burroughs, LCNP, presented the project and explained the need to respond to the WMD Commission’s report in order build on and show support for the recommendations contained therein. Jacqueline Cabasso, WSLF, spoke about the United States nuclear programmes and pointed out the dangers of the decision to develop new warheads to replace old ones, and countered the argument that that building these new warheads would be in line with Article 6 of the NPT. Michael Spies, LCNP, talked about global problems on such controversial issues as nuclear power and Iran, and pointed out the lack of mechanism that would deal with non-compliance with the NPT. Jennifer Nordstrom gave an overview of the activity in the Conference on Disarmament. She also highlighted the necessity of including a gendered perspective in discussing arms control and disarmament, especially in relation to weapons of mass destruction. Jennifer emphasized the importance of avoiding such socialized concepts as disarmament and negotiations as “weak” and “female” while armament and proliferation are seen as “tough”, “masculine”, and to have them means you’re part of the “big boys club”.

Henrik Salander, who served as the Secretary General of the WMD Commission, attended the event and thanked the authors for their contribution of this book. He also assured the authors that neither he nor Dr. Hans Blix were unhappy with the criticism. In fact, he said, the opposite is true, it is vital to keep the discussion around the report and the recommendations alive in order to take the discussion forward.

A copy of “Nuclear Disorder or Cooperative Security?” will be provided to each delegation at the NPT and can also be purchased for 9 €. A summary of the book and its recommendations are available on www.wmdreport.org.
Tuesday was a busy day for mayors, with Mayors for Peace and Pressehütte co-sponsoring a Workshop with Mayor Akiba in the morning, and Mayors for Peace hosting an event in the afternoon for people to sign on to the Cities Are Not Targets (CANT) campaign. The goal of the workshop today, and CANT in a broader context, is to mobilize citizens around their elected city officials in order to affect government policy on nuclear weapons. As Mayor Akiba of Hiroshima pointed out during the workshop, national leaders can use democracy to implement the 2020 Vision Campaign (also led by Mayors for Peace) and CANT. He described governments as complex bodies consisting of citizens, experts, the military, scientific and technical specialists, and so forth, and suggested that we need to look at how the complex moves and makes decisions in order to direct its interests. And, as the afternoon event emphasized, when seven elected city officials and everyone else in the room signed onto the CANT petition, these campaigns bring the capacity for change to the level of citizens and municipal government.

To demonstrate these possibilities, Aaron Tovish, International Campaign Manager of Mayors for Peace, outlined what mayors can do to make sure nuclear weapons are given adequate attention in US federal office. He suggested that if the mayors of major US cities called on presidential candidates to have a debate on the safety of their cities in an international context, focusing on the danger of nuclear accidents, nuclear terrorism, and nuclear war, most candidates would find it difficult to turn down this invitation, thus placing nuclear issues squarely on their agendas. Mayor Akiba also suggested that mayors can attract media attention by participating in city-wide events, such as running a marathon, and then giving a speech about nuclear issues, drawing attention to the above campaigns and to their involvement with them.
Many statements in the general debate at the NPT PrepCom have referred to the renewed interest in nuclear energy, and many have promoted it outright, adding words like “proliferation responsible” or “proliferation resistant”. While the NPT does include nuclear energy as an “inalienable right”, we know better now than we did in 1970 that the technology itself is the part of the proliferation problem.

Research and training reactors, ostensibly acquired in support of a power program or for other civil purposes, have been the plutonium source for weapons in India and Israel and have been used for weapons-related research and experiments in numerous other countries including Iraq, Iran, South Korea, North Korea, Taiwan, Yugoslavia, and possibly Romania.

Of the ten states known to have produced nuclear weapons:
* Eight have nuclear power reactors.
* North Korea has no operating power reactors but an ‘Experimental Power Reactor’ is believed to have been the source of the fissile material (plutonium) used in the October 2006 nuclear bomb test.
* Israel has no power reactors, though the pretense of an interest in the development of nuclear power helped to justify nuclear transfers to Israel.
* Power reactors are certainly used in support of India’s nuclear weapons program. This has long been suspected and is no longer in doubt since India is refusing to subject numerous power reactors to safeguards under the US/India nuclear agreement.
* Pakistan may be using power reactor/s in support of its nuclear weapons program.
* The US itself is using a power reactor to produce tritium for use in nuclear weapons.
* The 1962 test of sub-weapon-grade plutonium by the US may have used plutonium from a power reactor.
* Then Australian Prime Minister John Gorton certainly had military ambitions for the power reactor he pushed to have constructed in the late 1960s – he later admitted that the agenda was to produce both electricity as well as plutonium for potential use in weapons.

Indirect connections between nuclear power and weapons

Nuclear power reactors per sé need not be directly involved in weapons research/production in order for a nuclear power program to provide cover and support for a weapons program.

The nuclear weapons programs in South Africa and Pakistan were clearly outgrowths of their power programs although enrichment plants, not power reactors, produced the fissile material for use in weapons.

So nuclear power programs can facilitate weapons programs and weapons production even if power reactors per sé are not used to produce fissile material for weapons. Furthermore, nuclear power programs can facilitate weapons programs even if power reactors are not actually built. Iraq provides a clear illustration of this point. While Iraq’s nuclear research program provided much cover for the weapons program, stated interest in developing nuclear power was also significant.

According to Khidhir Hamza, a senior nuclear scientist involved in Iraq’s weapons program: “Acquiring nuclear technology within the IAEA safeguards system was the first step in establishing the infrastructure necessary to develop nuclear weapons. In 1973, we decided to acquire a 40-megawatt research reactor, a fuel manufacturing plant, and nuclear fuel reprocessing facilities, all under cover of acquiring the expertise needed to eventually build and operate nuclear power plants and produce and recycle nuclear fuel. Our hidden agenda was to clandestinely develop the expertise and infrastructure needed to produce weapon-grade plutonium.”

---
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Work of both the independent Group of Scientific Experts on the detection of nuclear-weapons-usable materials production (iGSE) and the International Panel on Fissile Materials (IPFM) is made possible by a grant of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.
A Revised Nuclear Weapons Convention

Michael Spies, Lawyers’ Committee on Nuclear Policy

In a lunchtime event, representatives from the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms (IALANA), the International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation (INESAP), and the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW) presented a revised version of the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention (MNWC). Originally drafted in 1997 by a group of scientists, lawyers, and disarmament experts, the document was circulated as UN Document A/C.1/52/7.

Panelists included Carlos Vargas from the mission of Costa Rica, the country which originally sponsored the MNWC at the UN General Assembly, and Knut Langeland from the mission of Norway. After describing his country’s history with the MNWC, Ambassador Vargas announced that his delegation will introduce the revised MNWC to the PrepCom as an official document, not as a proposal to lead to negotiations on a treaty banning all nuclear weapons, but rather as a tool to assist in deliberations. Ambassador Langeland, however, expressed a degree of skepticism in the MNWC concept, stating that the NPT itself is the key instrument for disarmament. In this regard he pointed to the number of related steps still to be implemented (FMCT, CTBT, etc.) and cautioned against prematurely shopping for new regimes due to the uncertainty of the outcome.

NGO panelists included Jürgen Scheffran of INESAP, and Alyn Ware and Jacqueline Cabasso of IALANA. Scheffran described the MNWC’s approach on verification in all its aspects and warned that a standard of absolute verification would not be necessary for the confident maintenance of a nuclear weapon free world. Under such an arrangement, any perceived benefit from the acquisition of a small number of nuclear weapons would be outweighed by the costs of abandoning the advantages gained by participating in institutions assuring collective security. Ware provided an Article by Article description of the MNWC. Cabasso discussed the issues of erasing nuclear knowledge and the role of U.S. nuclear weapons laboratories in perpetuating vertical proliferation by developing infrastructure, which has enabled the advanced nuclear weapon states to indefinitely maintain their nuclear arsenals without resorting to underground nuclear explosive testing.

The revised MNWC is featured in a new publication released on Monday, at the launch of the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN), by the sponsoring organizations entitled, Securing our Survival: The Case for a Nuclear Weapons Convention, which provides explanation and commentary on the MNWC. Securing our Survival is available online and in print from the ICAN website, www.icanw.org.

What approaches should be taken to ensure a positive outcome of the 2010 NPT Review Conference?
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The NAC is Back!

Bringing a few concrete recommendations and a pretty strong disarmament statement, the New Agenda Coalition seems to have returned with ideas and enthusiasm to the NPT. Ireland has served as coordinator of this cross regional group that includes Brazil, Egypt, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa, and Sweden, for the last six months. It seems that the NAC has been finding some inspiration, though it is still early in the conference to know for certain. Always a proponent of transparency and verifiability, its suggestion that the nuclear weapons states publish their aggregate holdings of nuclear weapons on active and reserve status should be acted on in order to provide accurate baseline data so that a “series of phased transparent, verifiable and irreversible reductions” can take place and Article 6 obligations can be better fulfilled.

A European proposal for nuclear disarmament.

Friday, May 4, 2007
13:15-14:45

NGO Room in the Austria Center

Dominique Lalanne (France), Abolition 2000-Europe/Stop Essais;
Peter Nicholls (U.K.), Abolition 2000 UK;
Pol d’Huyvetter (Belgium), For Mother Earth/Abolition 2000 - Europe;
Axel Schwanhäusser (Germany), Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy, University of Hamburg

Discussion: How can the European Nuclear Weapons States and NATO respond to the Hans Blix WMD Commission’s recommendations?
Plutonium production

Power reactors have been responsible for the production of a vast quantity of weapons-useable plutonium. A typical power reactor (1000 MWe) produces about 300 kilograms of plutonium each year. Total global production of plutonium in power reactors is about 70 tonnes per year. As at the end of 2003, power reactors had produced an estimated 1,600 tonnes of plutonium.

Using the above figures, and assuming that 10 kilograms of (reactor-grade) plutonium is required to produce a weapon with a destructive power comparable to that of the plutonium weapon dropped on Nagasaki in 1945:
* The plutonium produced in a single reactor each year is sufficient for 30 weapons.
* Total global plutonium production in power reactors each year is sufficient to produce 7,000 weapons.
* Total accumulated ‘civil’ plutonium is sufficient for 160,000 weapons.

Another concern is that using a power reactor to produce many hundreds of kilograms of weapon-grade plutonium per year could hardly be simpler – all that needs to be done is to shorten the irradiation time, thereby maximizing the production of plutonium-239 relative to other, unwanted plutonium isotopes. Just a few kilograms of this weapon-grade plutonium is required for one nuclear weapon.

Adding to the proliferation risk is the growing stockpile of separated plutonium, as reprocessing outstrips the use of plutonium in MOX (mixed oxide fuel containing plutonium and uranium) and its (negligible) use in fast neutron ‘breeder’ reactors.

A longer, referenced version of this article is posted at: <www.foe.org.au/campaigns/anti-nuclear/issues>.
Stockholm, Sweden, 30 April 2007

Representatives of organisations from Sweden, Finland, United Kingdom, Austria, Germany, France, Denmark, Russia, Czech Republic, Slovenia, Netherlands, Canada, and the United States, who met at an international meeting on nuclear issues in Stockholm over the weekend (27-29 April), have issued the following open letter to national delegations and international agencies represented at the preparatory committee for the Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT) review being held in Vienna for the next two weeks.

Dear Delegations:

As the current generation of nuclear power plants and nuclear weapons are coming to the end of their planned lifetimes, we believe it is an opportune moment in history for the commitment to nuclear technology, for both civilian and military purposes, to be phased out and replaced by sustainable energy and real security policies.

It is the time to establish a new International Sustainable Energy Agency (ISEA) alongside the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which for its part should have its promotional role backing nuclear power development worldwide removed, and should concentrate instead on applying fully international safeguards and security oversight.

We recognise that the development of so-called Fourth Generation of nuclear reactors, will inevitably lead to the increase in the commercial trade and transport of fissile materials, most notably plutonium, as a nuclear fuel, which will become an increasing target for terrorists.

We insist that therefore the important benefits to World Security of a fissile materials ban (fissban) would only be possible if, as part of an agreed ban, all separation of plutonium through reprocessing is halted.

We insist that the use of depleted uranium (DU) from commercial reprocessing for making DU munitions is not a peaceful end use of uranium, and furthermore, believe such military use is a crime against humanity under the Geneva Conventions.

We very strongly believe that the Non Nuclear Weapons States participating in the Vienna conference should make clear to the Nuclear Weapons State participants their demand that the nuclear armed powers should live up to their NPT Treaty commitments under Article 6 to negotiate away their nuclear arsenals, and should also forego any new developments of nuclear weapons and their associated technologies; and if they refuse, the non nuclear states should withdraw from the Treaty.

CONTACT:
Ulla Klötzer, Women for Peace, Finland: ullaklotzer@yahoo.com
Eia Liljegren-Palmaer, FMKK, Sweden: eia_liljegren@swipnet.se
Dr David Lowry, Energy and Security consultant, UK: drdavidlowry@hotmail.com
+44 774-050 3518

International Call on Governments to back sustainable energy and security policies at Vienna meeting on nuclear non proliferation
What’s On
Today’s Calendar of Events

Abolition Caucus Strategy Meeting: Open
Where: NGO Room in the Austria Center (02 C 246)
When: 8-9 am
Contact: Anthony Salloum
Website: www.abolition2000.org

Governmental Briefing: Ambassador Paul Meyer Canada
Where: NGO Room in the Austria Center (02 C 246)
When: 9-10 am

NGO presentations to the PrepCom
Where: Plenary Room A
When: 10 am - 1 pm

Exhibition on Japanese disarmament and nonproliferation education campaign.
Where: Austria Center, Room 02 C 251
When: 10 am - 5 pm

Towards 2010: Priorities for NPT Consensus.
An MPI panel
Where: NGO Room in the Austria Center (02 C 246)
When: 1:15-2:45 pm
Contact: Jim Wurst, Middle Powers Initiative
Website: www.gs institute.org; www.middlepowers.org

Movie Screening: On A Paper Crane
Where: Austria Center, Room 02 C 251
When: 1-3 pm

Governmental Briefing: Ambassador Duncan of the United Kingdom
Where: NGO Office (next to NGO meeting room)
When: 2 - 3 pm

Future Energy Supply: Nuclear Energy and Renewable Energy in the Light of the NPT
Where: NGO Room in the Austria Center (02 C 246)
When: 3-5 pm
Contact: Wolfgang Schlupp-Hauck, Press Hut (German: Pressehütte), in cooperation with Mayors for Peace
Website: www.pressehuette.de

Global Article 9 Campaign to Abolish War
Where: NGO Room in the Austria Center (02 C 246)
When: 5:30-7:15 pm
Contact: Akira Kawasaki

Future Energy Supply:
Nuclear Energy and Renewable Energy in the Light of the NPT

Wednesday, May 2, 3:00 – 5:00 pm
NGO Room (02 C 246) – Austria Center, Vhienna

Moderated by Regina Hagen
Coordinator, INESAP

Ian Facer
Technical Engineer, International Atomic Energy Agency

Zia Mian
Research Scientist, Program on Science and Global Security at Princeton University

Jürgen Scheffran
Senior Research Scientist, Program in Arms Control, Disarmament and International Security (ACDIS) at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

Alice Slater
New York Director, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, and co-founder of Abolition 2000

Towards 2010:
Priorities for NPT Consensus

A Middle Powers Initiative panel featuring:

The Hon. Douglas Roche, O.C., Chairman of MPI, chairing the session

and as panelists:

H.E. Sergio De Queiroz Duarte, President of the 2005 NPT Review Conference; Head of the Brazilian delegation to the first session of the NPT preparatory committee

Dr. John Burroughs, Executive Director, Lawyers’ Committee on Nuclear Policy; Co-editor of Nuclear Disorder or Cooperative Security?

Where: NGO Room in the Austria Center
When: 1:15-2:45, Wednesday, May 2

Contact: Jim Wurst, Middle Powers Initiative, jwurst@gs institute.org
Website: www.middlepowers.org