PrepCom participants appeared fairly surprised yesterday morning when Iran, after a long-winded statement that sounded like an explanation for blocking the agenda, suddenly said it “had the honor to announce” it could agree to the agenda and South Africa’s proposal from Friday. The Conference then agreed to the agenda, the understanding that “compliance with the Treaty” means with all provisions of the Treaty, and to proceed with the indicative timetable. Then, instead of packing our bags and heading home, we proceeded to substantive debate on Cluster 1 issues yesterday afternoon.

The morning session was not without its fireworks, of course. Iran did not accept the South African proposal as it was, but amended it so that there is an explicit connection between the understanding of the “compliance” phrase and the agenda (via a familiar asterisk). Chairman Amano nearly complicated the matter by separating the amendment from the proposal before South Africa welcomed it, clarified it, and no one objected. The ordinarily subdued Japanese Chair showed frustration and even gave a rebuttal to the attacks delivered in Iran’s “acceptance speech”, citing dates and occasions of his consultations on the agenda.

By the end of the day, however, we found ourselves settling into meeting mode. The PrepCom spent the afternoon buzzing through 26 statements on Cluster 1, which is generally understood as the nuclear disarmament cluster. Chairman Amano had requested states to keep to five minutes or less, and a number of delegations shortened their delivered statements while circulating longer written statements. Governments across the political spectrum reaffirmed their commitment to the outcomes of the 1995 and 2000 review conferences. Egypt reminded the PrepCom that the indefinite extension of the NPT was largely agreed to because of the resolution calling for a nuclear weapon free zone in the Middle East. Canada articulated the general understanding of the international community that the 13 practical steps towards nuclear disarmament from 2000 are the objective benchmarks by which to measure compliance with Article VI of the Treaty. The New Agenda Coalition noted that these steps are the agreed process for systematic nuclear disarmament.

States also highlighted various steps of the 13 practical steps, and commented on their implementation. It was regularly noted that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty has not entered into force, and a treaty banning the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons has not been negotiated. Governments also called for further verified treaty-based reductions from the US and Russia, and, while noting what has been done, generally assessed that it has not been enough. Many states also called for a diminished role for nuclear weapons in security doctrines, and noted concern about new military doctrines with expanded scenarios for nuclear use, and the development of new nuclear weapons. States called for the nuclear weapon states to de-alert their nuclear weapons, reducing the immediate risks of accidental nuclear war.

Governments also reaffirmed the importance of transparency, irreversibility, and verification in disarmament measures. Canada, New Zealand, Norway, Mexico, the Republic of Korea, Brazil, Australia, and Iran supported submitting regular reports on the implementation of Article VI, as called for in step 12 of the 13 steps. Canada gave details on what this reporting might look like, while Brazil suggested the Secretariat make a chart of disarmament measures based on statements delivered by the nuclear weapon states, which Canada supported. Because Reaching Critical Will also believes such reporting is necessary for the international community to monitor Article VI implementation, we produce a Model Nuclear Inventory for each NPT meeting. (Please see the RCW team to get your delegation’s copy.) States Parties should make such reporting and monitoring a feature of the review process.

Although we do not have much time left at this PrepCom, we do have a great deal of substance. After 26 statements impressively delivered almost entirely within the five-minute time limit set by the Chair, there were a couple minutes left for “interactive debate”. This morning, governments will focus on nuclear disarmament and security assurances, and will hopefully have more time for discussion. Leaving the chamber, participants could be seen bewilderedly muttering, “We have a PrepCom. A late PrepCom, a short PrepCom, but a PrepCom.”
Across
1. What did the international community spend approximately US$1 trillion on in 2005?
5. What Article of the NPT calls for good faith negotiations on nuclear disarmament?
6. How many Annex II states have still not ratified the CTBT?
7. Approximately how many times has the US threatened to use nuclear weapons since developing them?*
10. World’s largest producer of uranium
11. Approximately how many nuclear weapons does the US possess?
12. ____ Review lays out the direction of US nuclear forces
13. The NPT PrepCom is a _____ forum for disarmament.
14. What NGO is leading the campaign for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons by 2020?

*See Joseph Gerson, Empire and the Bomb

Down
2. A major problem with nuclear energy
3. Where did India and Pakistan test their nuclear weapons in 1998?
4. Approximately how many nuclear weapons has the US dismantled since 1998?
8. NGO project that produces a Model Nuclear Inventory
9. The ____ is back.
Article 1 of the NPT states that
“Each nuclear-weapon State Party to the Treaty undertakes not to transfer to any recipient whatsoever nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or control over such weapons or explosive devices directly, or indirectly; and not in any way to assist, encourage, or induce any non-nuclear-weapon State to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, or control over such weapons or explosive devices.”

Further, the Security Council unanimously voted in favour of resolution 1172 (1998) after the nuclear weapons tests of India and Pakistan. The resolution was co-sponsored by the US and urges India and Pakistan “immediately to stop their nuclear weapon development programs... and any further production of fissile material for nuclear weapons” and encourages “all States to prevent the export of equipment, materials or technology that could in any way assist programmes in India or Pakistan for nuclear weapons or for ballistic missiles capable of delivering such weapons, and welcomes national policies adopted and declared in this respect.”

Despite this, the United States and India are currently negotiating a nuclear cooperation agreement. The proposed agreement provides India with nuclear materials and technology from the United States, even though India is not an NPT party, and therefore does not have full scope safeguards, and has been repeatedly urged to join the NPT as a non-nuclear weapon state.

On Friday, May 4, the International Panel on Fissile Materials and the International Network on Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation held a seminar on this issue.

Dr. Zia Mian, International Panel on Fissile Materials, Dr. Jim Green, Friends of the Earth, Akira Kawasaki, Peace Boat, and Aaron Tovish, Mayors for Peace, discussed nuclear reactors in India, uranium exports, the various articles of the NPT violated by the deal, and upcoming decision of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG). Dr. Mian addressed the main problem with this deal: such nuclear cooperation could be used to add significantly to India’s stock of nuclear weapons, resulting in a dramatic acceleration in the nuclear arms race in South Asia.

By creating the equivalent of a sixth nuclear-weapon state and freeing up indigenous fissile material supplies for weapons purposes, the US-India deal directly and fundamentally undermines the NPT treaty, subsequent decisions made at the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences, several Security Council resolutions, and several Nuclear Weapon Free Zone Treaties.

However, according to the US legislation on the deal, it requires approval from the NSG which operates by consensus and will be required to either change its rules or to make an exemption in order to approve the deal. Rather than foster a potentially large expansion of the South Asian nuclear arms race, the NSG countries should seek to support the United Nations Security Council Resolution. They should try to strengthen the long-standing international effort to end all production of highly enriched uranium and plutonium to make nuclear weapons.

Abolition 2000, a network of more than 2000 organisations in 90 countries, is now launching a one-year campaign on the US-India Nuclear deal, with a special focus on the member states of NSG. Abolition 2000 is calling on members of the NSG to resist any effort to decide on this matter until the question of the deal’s compliance with the NPT is properly resolved. The network is calling on the USA at this PrepCom to justify the deal and demonstrate just how it does not violate Article 1 of the NPT.
Don’t Miss a Single Issue

“I read every line in the latest issue of Arms Control Today, which I think was superb.”
—Hans Blix

“Arms Control Today is a highly professional publication with articles that are of direct relevance to today’s issues.”
—Ambassador Chris Sanders of the Netherlands

“Like many on Capitol Hill, I turn repeatedly to Arms Control Today for background, insight, and authoritative analysis.”
—Congressman John M. Spratt, Jr., (D-S.C.)

Original reporting
Ground-breaking analysis
In-depth interviews

Arms Control Today is the source on nonproliferation and global security!

To subscribe to the print edition of Arms Control Today please visit www.armscontrol.org/subscribe.asp
Have we all forgotten about Pelindaba?

Tim Wright, International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons

Africa’s Treaty of Pelindaba is the only nuclear weapon free zone treaty that has not yet entered into force. At this NPT PrepCom session, several governments (as well as groups of governments, such as the Non-Aligned Movement) have emphasized in their opening statements or in working papers the importance of nuclear weapon free zones. However, little attention has been given to the failure of African states to ratify Pelindaba.

Over the last week, representatives of the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) have spoken to delegates from Egypt, Ghana, Mozambique, Namibia, and Tunisia about the benefits of and urgent need for ratification. With the exception of Egypt (which has a position of not ratifying Pelindaba until the Middle East becomes a nuclear weapon free zone or weapon of mass destruction free zone), all delegations imparted that their foreign ministries are either in the process of ratifying Pelindaba or are actively considering ratification.

The Treaty will enter into force when the African Union receives the 28th instrument of ratification. It has so far received 21. The newest state party to the Treaty is Rwanda, which ratified earlier this year. Several other governments — among them Malawi, Zambia, and Uganda — have committed to ratifying the treaty by the end of the year. ICAN predicts that entry into force will take place in 2008, and urges all African states and nuclear weapon states that have not yet done so to ratify the treaty as soon as practicable.

Even though Pelindaba has not entered into force, all countries that have ratified it have a legal obligation to abide by its terms — as specified in the Vienna Convention on Treaties of 1969. Pelindaba prohibits states parties from providing nuclear material or equipment to another country unless the transfer is subject to International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. Therefore, participation in the United States–India deal by African states parties to Pelindaba (such as South Africa) would be contrary to the treaty.

A Death Plan?

Beatrice Fihn, Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom

Yesterday, the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation and the International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation organized a seminar with the provocative title: US nuclear weapons policy – A death plan for Humanity?

David Krieger, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, made a presentation on different controversial parts of the US nuclear weapons policy. He discussed double standards in the US approach to its allies and other states, and the fact that the US dangerously continues to insist that “all options are on the table” with regard to Iran. In US policy, there is both a threat of preventive use and very unclear limitations on how these weapons can be used. Nick Roth, also from Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, talked about debates in the American Congress, where decisions on how to deal with stockpiles take place. The Congress is currently discussing whether they should extend the current lifetime of existing warheads, deploy new ones without testing them, or deploy new warheads and test them. Roth regretted that no fourth option, like abolition of nuclear weapons, had been put forward.

Götz Neuneck, Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy at the University of Hamburg, discussed US plans to create a Global Missile Defense system, with stations in Poland and the Czech Republic. These are not supposed to be aimed at Russia, but are clearly triggering a Russian reaction from an understanding that this is a threat.

Jackie Cabasso, Western States Legal Foundation, emphasized the importance of discussing a wider context for nuclear weapons, which includes delivery systems and manufacturing plans as well as warheads. Cabasso also discussed the US nuclear triad, which the US has posited means it relies less on nuclear strike capabilities. However, the offensive strike capability corner of the new triad includes the entire former triad, consisting of heavy bombers, ICBMs, and SLBMs. These therefore have the same importance as they did in the former triad.

When the United States and Russia should be taking the lead in nuclear disarmament, the US is proliferating missiles and renewing its stockpiles. This negative leadership could disturb future multilateral disarmament negotiations. As Cabasso pointed out, a paradigm shift is in order, in which a change in the perception of security can take place.
Nuclear Disorder or Cooperative Security?
U.S. Weapons of Terror, the Global Proliferation Crisis, and Paths to Peace

$12 ($9) • $3 shipping and handling • 275 pages • soft cover • 2007

We should all be grateful to the authors, who remind us so powerfully of the dangers that remain from our own government’s nuclear weapons, and of the vital centrality of international law as our weapon to abolish them.
-Phyllis Bennis, Institute for Policy Studies

This book is an important contribution to the effort to rid our planet of weapons of mass destruction, and I encourage my colleagues in Congress to read it.
-Congresswoman Barbara Lee

With clear prose, the authors add cogent analysis and new urgency to the often uneven, staled, and ill-informed discourse on the provocative U.S. role in nuclear proliferation.
-Frida Berrigan, World Policy Institute

This assessment of our Final Report and its 50 recommendations is exactly the kind of response we were hoping for.
-Hans Blix, Chairman, Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission

This lucid, compelling book presents concise, detailed directions for reducing nuclear dangers on the path to disarmament, a reliable road-guide away from the nuclear abyss. But it simultaneously reports that the current U.S. administration is reading the map upside down. There is no time to lose for the passengers on planet earth to take hold of the wheel, reverse course, turn this map right-side up, and let its authors pilot us to safety.
-Daniel Ellsberg

With professional clarity, Nuclear Disorder or Cooperative Security unpacks the policy issues and international security principles at stake in the debate about nuclear weapons.
-Jonathan Granoff, Global Security Institute

Nuclear Disorder or Cooperative Security offers in-depth analysis and recommendations regarding U.S. policy in relation to the international security framework, nuclear weapons R&D, missiles and weapons in space, climate change and nuclear power, and demilitarization and redefining security in human terms. A response to the report of the Hans Blix-led Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission, it is the product of collaboration between the Lawyers’ Committee on Nuclear Policy, Western States Legal Foundation, and the Reaching Critical Will project of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom.

International Launch
Tuesday, May 1, 1:15pm-2:45pm
NGO Room - Austria Center - Vienna

www.wmreport.org
1 July 1946 marks the date of the first nuclear test in the Pacific. An officer of the US Army told the people of the tiny Bikini Island that it would be for the “sake of mankind”, so the Micronesians left their island not aware that they would never be able to live on their homeland again. On 2 July 1966, the French government waged the first test at Moruroa, French Polynesia. In 1996, the nuclear tests in the South Pacific finally ended. So we look back on 50 years of nuclear testing in the Pacific. Even though the tests are over now the people of the region still suffer from the consequences of the nuclear tests.

More than 300 of the over 2,000 nuclear tests worldwide took place in the Pacific region. Some of them had an enormous explosive force, such as the nuclear test on 1 March 1954 when the USA detonated the bomb with the code name “Bravo” at the Bikini Atoll. This bomb had an explosive force of around 17,000 kilotons – 1,300 times more than the Hiroshima bomb. The people of Rongelap, which is located 150 km away from the Bikini Atoll, did not know about the dangers of radioactivity and fall-out. No one informed them. The children played with the “white snow” falling from the sky and could not imagine that they would get very sick. Only 48 hours after the detonation of the bomb, the US Marines picked up the people of Rongelap and brought them to the military base at Kwajalein Atoll and after this to Majuro. Three years later Rongelap was declared “safe” by scientists of the USA and the people settled back on their homeland. But Rongelap was still not “safe” and still isn’t. The environment, which is the basic nourishment of the island people, was poisoned by radioactivity and life was not really possible. Many of the inhabitants got leukaemia, thyroid cancer, or other forms of cancer. Many women became infertile or gave birth to children which had nothing to do with human beings. The people of Bikini and Rongelap lost their homeland and their cultural basis as well as their self-sufficiency. After years of suffering the Rongelap people asked the USA to take them away from their homeland because they could not stand life anymore. The USA was deaf to the call, so Greenpeace used the “Rainbow Warrior” to bring them to the tiny Mejato Island at the Kwajalein Atoll.

Two months after the “Rainbow Warrior” took the Rongelap people to the Kwajalein Atoll, the flagship of Greenpeace was attacked by an assault of the French Intelligent Service. The photo-journalist Fernando Pereira died. The French government did almost 200 tests at Moruroa and Fangataufa. The government still refuses to pay compensation to the Maohi – the indigenous people of French Polynesia – who worked at the test sites doing dangerous work like taking samples after the tests or decontamination work.

Last year, on the occasion of the sixtieth and fortieth anniversaries of the first nuclear tests undertaken by the foreign American and European powers, the Pacific Network Germany and the Pacific Information Desk in Germany launched an exhibition on 50 years of nuclear testing in the Pacific to remind people of this sad chapter of military and political history. Today, little is known about the nuclear tests in the Pacific region and on their outcomes — especially in the younger generation. We from the Pacific Network Germany and the Pacific Information Desk have worked over 20 years now on this issue and we see it as our duty to inform the public.

Therefore, we launched the exhibition for educational purposes in schools and other educational institutions. Along with lectures and publications we try to make the issue more present in the minds of the people to remind them that the Pacific Islanders suffered because western powers were eager to construct nuclear weapons. We show that there are already — alongside with the people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and people from other test sites – many people in the world who had and have to still carry the burden of the military use of nuclear power.

The exhibition can be requested for free (only costs are for transportation of the box, which weighs around 8 kilos) by any person or institution for educational purposes. Nine textile banners educate about 50 years of nuclear testing in the Pacific and the current military use of nuclear technology. At the conference in Vienna, the exhibition will be on display until 8th May.

For more information please contact:
Pacific Information Desk
Katja Goebel
Hauptstraße 2, 91564 Neuendettelsau, GERMANY
Phone: +49-9874-9122, Fax: +49-9874-93120
Mail: info@pazifik-infostelle.org, www.pazifik-infostelle.org
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Hauptstraße 2, 91564 Neuendettelsau, GERMANY
Phone: +49-9874-9122, Fax: +49-9874-93120
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Abolition Caucus Strategy Meeting: Open
Where: NGO Room in the Austria Center (02 C 246)
When: 8-9am
Contact: Anthony Salloum
Website: www.abolition2000.org

NGO Briefing with Ambassador Kavanagh of Ireland
Where: NGO Room in the Austria Center (02 C 246)
When: 9-10am

Weapons in Space and the Disarmament/Nonproliferation Regime
Where: Plenary Room A
When: 1:15-2:45
Contact: Rhianna Tyson, Program Officer for Global Security Institute
Website: www.gsinstitute.org

CTBTO’s “Putting an end to nuclear test explosions: 10 years of building the verification regime and the lessons learned from the 9 October 2006 event in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea”
Where: The New Operations Centre of the CTBTO, Vienna International Centre, E-building, 6th floor
When: 2-3pm
Contact: info@ctbto.org; +43 (1) 26030 6200
Website: www.ctbto.org
Space is limited. Please sign up with one of the CTBTO officers at the CTBTO information desk in Foyer A or contact us at info@ctbto.org or +43 (1) 26030 6200.

Governmental Briefing with Germany, Mr. Rudiger Ludeking
Where: NGO Room in the Austria Center (02 C 246)
When: 8-9am

Abolition Caucus Strategy Meeting: Open
Where: NGO Room in the Austria Center (02 C 246)
When: 9-10am
Contact: Anthony Salloum
Website: www.abolition2000.org

Implementing Disarmament Education
Where: NGO Room in the Austria Center (02 C 246)
When: 1:15-2:45
Contact: Kathleen Sullivan
Website: www.disarmamenteducation.org

CTBTO’s “Putting an end to nuclear test explosions: 10 years of building the verification regime and the lessons learned from the 9 October 2006 event in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea”
Where: The New Operations Centre of the CTBTO, Vienna International Centre, E-building, 6th floor
When: 2-3pm
Contact: info@ctbto.org; +43 (1) 26030 6200
Website: www.ctbto.org
Space is limited. Please sign up with one of the CTBTO officers at the CTBTO information desk in Foyer A or contact us at info@ctbto.org or +43 (1) 26030 6200.

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

NGO Briefing with Ambassador Millar of Australia
Where: NGO Room in the Austria Center (02 C 246)
When: 9-10am

Here you can hear introductory statements about the NPT PrepCom
from Susi Snyder http://cba.fro.at/m3u.php?eintrag_id=7154
and Jennifer Nordstrom http://cba.fro.at/m3u.php?eintrag_id=7153

Interviews by Angelika Hofmann, Servas International www.servas.org

www.radioattac.at