EDITORIAL: NUCLEAR RISKS
Ray Acheson | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

At every NPT meeting, time is devoted to the Treaty’s so-called third pillar, which guarantees the “inalienable right” to nuclear energy. Putting aside the problematic nature of this phrase—considering that inalienable rights are based on the concept of natural law—the “peaceful uses” pillar of the NPT is highly challenging for the other two pillars of disarmament and non-proliferation. Nuclear technology—for energy or weapons—comes with severe safety and security risks. Whether we look at the disaster at the Fukushima power station, the breach of Y-12 by an 82 year old nun, or the near-misses with the use of nuclear weapons, it’s quite clear that the risks of nuclear technology far outweigh any perceived benefits.

The effects of nuclear accidents do not respect national boundaries; even countries that have excluded nuclear power from their energy mixes are “still susceptible to suffering damage as a result of a nuclear accident elsewhere,” noted Mr. Ballard from New Zealand. And accidents will happen. The disaster at the Fukushima station is but one example of this. The devastating environmental and humanitarian consequences of that disaster are still being felt, and will be for generations to come.

But reactor accidents are not the only risk to human health and the environment posed by civilian nuclear programmes. “Nuclear power can never be 100% safe,” noted Ms. Wörgötter of Austria. Accidents, the long-term effects of the nuclear fuel cycle, and the combination of safety, security, and proliferation concerns mean that “nuclear power is neither a viable option in efforts to promote sustainable development nor to address climate change.”

In addition to safety risks, there is the challenge to security. So far, security challenges have focused almost exclusively on civilian programmes and facilities. Yet as Ambassador Motto Pinto Coelho of Brazil highlighted, all stockpiles of military nuclear material are exempt from multilateral control mechanisms. 98% of highly-enriched uranium stocks and 86% of separated plutonium stocks are possessed by nuclear-armed states. He explained that this concern has led Brazil and others to address this issue at the 2014 Nuclear Security Summit, arguing that it is impossible to disassociate the quest for nuclear security from disarmament. “A world that accepts nuclear weapons will always be insecure,” he argued.

From the production and storage of fissile materials to the stockpiling and deployment of nuclear weapons, safety and security risks are inherent in nuclear technology. Evidence provided by recent reports from Eric Schlosser, Article 36, and Chatham House on risks in the nuclear weapons complex demonstrate just how vulnerable the facilities, materials, equipment, and personnel are.

In July 2012, three peace activists broke into the Y-12 complex in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. The facility holds the US supply of highly-enriched uranium (HEU) for nuclear weapons. They hung banners, strung up crime scene tape, hammered off a small chunk of the facility inside the most secure part of the complex, and splashed their own blood on the bunker wall. The activists argued in court that their nonviolent actions were meant to draw attention to the immoral and illegal possession of nuclear weapons.

After the break-in, the complex was shut down, security forces were re-trained, and contractors were replaced. The activists have since been sentenced to time in prison. Sister Megan Rice, a nun who is now 84, received a sentence of 35 months, while her two colleagues, Michael Walli (64 years old) and Greg Boertje-Obed (59 years old) received 62 months. Sister Megan is currently being held in the Metropolitan Detention Center in Brooklyn, just a few miles away from the UN.

continued on next page
REPORT: NPD—I—WHAT NOW? WHAT NEXT?
Susi Snyder | PAX

In an event organised by PAX and the Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the question of what is next for NPD was examined on Friday. Speakers included Japanese Ambassador Sano, Australian Ambassador Woolcott, Dutch Ambassador van der Kwast, and Australian director for the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Tim Wright.

Ambassador Sano provided a brief overview of the recent NPD ministerial meeting in Hiroshima. He noted that the outcome statement included a call for all political leaders to visit Hiroshima and Nagasaki, as a way to best understand the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons.

Ambassador Woolcott elaborated on the NPD expectations of nuclear-armed states’ reports. He indicated that the reports received at this Preparatory Committee meeting are a first step, but still have significant shortcomings. Woolcott went on to elaborate that they should provide annual reports, with an increasing level of detail. The original working paper NPDI put forward with a model is the level of detail desired. He also indicated that the efforts to develop a glossary were welcome, especially to clarify definitions of “active,” “inactive,” “retired,” and “warhead”.

Ambassador van der Kwast presented on the recent Nuclear Security Summit in the Hague and the relationship between this parallel process and the NPT itself. He also highlighted the important role of academia, civil society, and industry, while elaborating on the success of the Nuclear Knowledge and Industry Summits that took place alongside the NSS.

Tim Wright recognised that the NPDI, definitely not a ‘like-minded’ group, must have intensive debates behind the scenes. From an outside perspective, the tensions among the group are evident, especially between those who do and those who do not rely on nuclear weapons in their security strategies. He elaborated, stating that the elimination of nuclear weapons will require their stigmatisation and delegitimisation, and it is difficult to see how the NPDI members are creating the conditions for elimination when a majority of them do not appear willing to devalue these inhumane weapons.

There was an intense discussion following the four presentations, which addressed ideas including non-nuclear deterrence models, a ban on low-threshold nuclear weapons, and whether the NPDI should continue as a non-like minded group at all. Most NPDI members participation found it difficult to address the question of whether the Initiative would continue into the next NPT review cycle. Some assume that this group will roll over along with the action plan, whereas others reflected that just rolling over the action plan might not be the most effective stepwise approach.

Susi Snyder from PAX chaired the session, and summed up the discussion noting that the NPDI clearly has divergent views, and while they are putting forward a significant number of working papers and other statements, there is still a question of whether quantity replaces quality.

Editorial, cont’d

This incident highlights the security risks associated with facilities dealing with nuclear materials and nuclear weapons. But it also highlights the broader risks of asserting that nuclear power is a “safe” or “clean” source of energy or that nuclear weapons bring security or strategic stability. “The world does not need nuclear arsenals for security, peace and survival,” argued Ambassador Aisi of Papua New Guinea. “What we need instead is to see the divestment of resources in this area and to put them to sustainable development of humanity rather than preparing for Armageddon.”
## CALENDAR OF EVENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When</th>
<th>What</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:50</td>
<td>Abolition Caucus</td>
<td>Room C Conference Building</td>
<td>Abolition 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:50</td>
<td>Government briefing for NGOs: Egypt</td>
<td>Room C Conference Building</td>
<td>Reaching Critical Will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-13:00</td>
<td>Plenary</td>
<td>Trusteeship Council Chamber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-13:00</td>
<td>The WMD Free Zone in the Middle East: Constructive Proposals for the Helsinki Process</td>
<td>Room C Conference Building</td>
<td>Academic Peace Orchestra Middle East, Peace Research Institute Frankfurt, Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-12:40</td>
<td>Simulated negotiations for a nuclear weapons convention</td>
<td>Room E North Lawn Building</td>
<td>Regina Hagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00-15:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:15-14:45</td>
<td>All in the Timing: The WMD Zone in the Middle East</td>
<td>Room C Conference Building</td>
<td>Permanent Mission of Ireland to the UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:15-14:45</td>
<td>Reinforcing international cooperation for the aims of developing nuclear energy</td>
<td>Room 6 North Lawn Building</td>
<td>Permanent Mission of France to the UN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:15-14:45</td>
<td>EU efforts to strengthen nuclear security</td>
<td>Room B Conference Building</td>
<td>European Union (EEAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-18:00</td>
<td>Plenary</td>
<td>Trusteeship Council Chamber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00-17:50</td>
<td>Thinking about disarmament in the 21st century</td>
<td>Room C Conference Building</td>
<td>Western States Legal Foundation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Come and observe

**Students negotiate a Nuclear Weapons Convention**

**Monday, 5 May 2014,**
10 am – 1 pm, 3 pm – 6 pm
in Room C, UN Conference Building

**Tuesday, 6 May 2014,**
10 am – 12:30 pm, 3 – 6 pm
in Conference Room E, UN North Lawn Building

**Chairs:**

*Delegates to the NPT PrepCom*

**Participants:**

*30 German university students*

30 German university students simulate the negotiation of a Nuclear Weapons Convention. In four sessions, they will negotiate Article I (Obligations) of the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention (UN document A/62/650).

**Come to observe**

for an hour or the whole day!

Contact: Regina Hagen, Technische Universität Darmstadt kontakt@reginahagen.de; mobile 1-617-335-8700
At an event hosted by the Permanent Missions of Japan and the Netherlands, Zia Mian and Alexander Glaser of the International Panel on Fissile Materials (IPFM) and Princeton University presented their analysis of the NPT nuclear-armed states’ 2010 NPT Action Plan progress reports as they related to nuclear warheads and fissile materials. Their slides will be available on the IPFM blog at http://www.fissilematerials.org/blog.

IPFM (along with non-weapon states and other civil society groups) hoped the nuclear armed states would develop a reporting form that helps establish a baseline upon which to assess progress towards nuclear disarmament. Unfortunately, this was not the case. Dr. Mian described the nuclear armed states as having agreed only on a table of contents for the reporting form rather than agreeing to provide substance.

Dr. Mian looked at nuclear-armed state reporting on actions 2 and 5 from the 2010 NPT Action Plan. Action 2 commits all states parties to the principles of irreversibility, verifiability, and transparency. All NPT nuclear-armed states have released some information about their arsenals, but with varying levels of details. Dr. Mian noted the US has declared the history of the size of its warheads in more detail than others but in an “unnecessarily ambiguous” way—using terms such as “several thousand” to describe retired warheads awaiting dismantlement. Russia has provided no new information, while the UK has recently re-declared the planned size of its arsenal while France declared an upper limit. China last reported on the size of its stockpile in 2004, only saying that its arsenal is smaller than the others.

For next steps on action 2, Dr. Mian recommended that the nuclear-armed states submit robust baseline declarations for nuclear warheads and warhead components and shared IPFM’s suggested warhead reporting form.

Action 5 (a) obligates the NPT nuclear-armed states to rapidly move towards an overall reduction in the global stockpile of all types of nuclear weapons. Dr. Mian noted that the only way to actually reduce warhead stockpiles is to dismantle the weapons, but there is ambiguity about
what qualifies as dismantlement. The dismantlement process is also extremely slow—the US still has warheads awaiting dismantlement since 1970–1990s. Warheads being taken out service by New START aren’t expected to be dismantled until 2030s. Meanwhile, Russia has not given any significant information about dismantlement; independent estimates suggest that 3500 warheads are in the queue. In moving forward, Dr. Mian recommended that nuclear-armed states offer regular reports on dismantlements and commit to a common understanding about what constitutes irreversible dismantlement.

Dr. Glaser covered actions 16, 18, 19, and 21. Action 16 relates to declaring excess fissile material and placing such material under IAEA safeguards. He noted that the US and UK have set an example of making baseline declarations of their fissile material stocks and called on the other nuclear-armed states to do the same. They should all also declare the histories of their fissile material production, use, and disposition.

On action 18, regarding dismantlement or conversion of fissile material production facilities, Dr. Glaser said that the nuclear-armed states should declare the status of and plans for these facilities. They also need to preserve records about the facilities, materials, and historical production so as to facilitate verification. He also suggested that they should agree on the most important types of operating records to be preserved. On action 19, related to improving transparency and verification for nuclear disarmament, he noted that while most of the nuclear-armed states have undertaken work on programmes and joint exercises, they need to all engage in efforts to jointly develop and demonstrate practical inspection systems and to further demonstrate the viability of cooperation between nuclear-armed and non-nuclear-armed states parties.

IPFM has produced a transparency matrix that looks at what a useful standard reporting form under action 21 should capture. The matrix reveals the inadequacy of the nuclear-armed states reporting to this PrepCom. Dr. Mian noted that opinions on the quality of these reports have ranged from disappointing to dismal. States parties must ask themselves if these reports are adequate in meeting the requirements of the action plan. The adequacy of the reports should be measured by the degree to which they enable an informed judgment on progress on these obligations.

Watch the full cartoon movie on youtu.be/J4qcxtbo5k

SWEDISH PHYSICIANS AGAINST NUCLEAR WEAPONS AFFILIATE OF PPNW

LEARN MORE about divestment and the involvement of banks and financial institutions in the nuclear weapons industry on www.dontbankonthebomb.com
Belief in the WMD Free Zone

The Tel-Aviv Roundtable process

Chair; Wilbert van der Zeijden – Senior reasercher at PAX

Llanet Vazquez – Herbert Scoville Jr. Peace Fellow at BASIC: Proposing an analytical regional perspective on the state of the WMD Free Zone process in the Middle East – remaining needs and requirements for the establishment of the zone.

Ward Wilson – Senior Fellow & Director of the Rethinking Nuclear Weapons project: About the Middle East nuclear discourse – political rather than military. About possible nuclear exchange and the danger of WMD in the Middle East.

Sharon Dolev – Director of the Israeli Disarmament Movement: About the round table process aimed at paving new paths towards WMD Free Zone in the Middle East, obstacles and opportunities.

Wednesday May 7th, 10:00 – 12:00
Room C
REPORT: ARCTIC NWFZ
Wilbert van der Zeijden | PAX

Hosted by Canadian Pugwash, this event explored the concept of an Arctic nuclear weapon free zone (NWFZ). Chaired by Erika Simpson, the panel consisted of Adele Buckley (former Chair of Canadian Pugwash), Dennis Bevington (MP, Canadian Western Arctic), Randy Rydell (Senior Political Affairs Officer, UNODA), and Alyn Ware (global coordinator for PNND).

Adele Buckley outlined the history of the proposal for an Arctic NWFZ and the increased strategic importance of the region due to climate change. Denmark has included the objective in its national Arctic policy. According to Ms Buckley, a specific complexity of the Arctic zone would be that several states involved would declare only part of their country ‘in the zone’. This would enable the two affected nuclear-armed states (Russia and the US) to participate. Challenges to overcome include the policies of these states and NATO membership of several others. Disagreements about its precise boundaries further complicate gathering support for initiating a process that could lead to such a zone.

Canadian MP Dennis Bevington elaborated on the Arctic Assembly of Parliamentarians as an instrumental forum for discussions on Arctic issues. The Arctic Council is growing in importance but does not currently discuss security cooperation. Mr. Bevington said that the focus needs to stay on international cooperation, as strong support from both inside and outside of the region is needed to maintain the idea of the Arctic as a zone of peace.

Randy Rydell pointed out that NWFZs could be much more than just zones free of nuclear weapons. They provide regions with tools to deal with regional disputes and support regional cooperation. He highlighted the importance of the inclusion of indigenous peoples in the process.

The final speaker, Alyn Ware, noted that some have said that an Arctic NWFZ would be more difficult to achieve than previous NWFZs because of the presence of two nuclear-armed states in the region. But Mr. Ware reminded the audience that for example to achieve the Latin American NWFZ, Argentina and Brazil abandoned their nascent nuclear weapons programmes.

REPORT: NWC SIMULATION
Arianna Framvik Malik | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF

A two-day simulated negotiation of a nuclear weapons convention (NWC) began on Monday, with students from the University of Hamburg and the Technische Universitaet Darmstadt. The simulation was instigated for the seventh year in a row by the International Network of Engineers and Scientists Against Proliferation.

The simulation, focusing this year on negotiating article 1 (obligations), takes place in a fictitious scenario where the Israeli prime minister has indicated that Israel has the possibility to defend itself using nuclear weapons. This has resulted in the twenty-two Arab League nations announcing their three months notice for their withdrawal from the NPT. In order to solve the crises, the negotiations on a comprehensive and verifiable NWC that would outlaw this class of weapons completely are initiated, and a small number of states are tasked by the UN Security Council and the Conference on Disarmament to undertake negotiations.

Playing the roles of Brazil, China, Egypt, France, Germany, India, Iran, Israel, Malaysia, Pakistan, Russia, South Africa, and the United States, the first session started out with each nation presenting prepared statements in at times heated discussion. Whilst countries such as Brazil, Egypt, South Africa, and Iran expressed their deep disappointment in the recent events, China, France, Germany, India, Malaysia, Russia, and the USA continued to urge to keep to the step-by-step approach as the only path to reach complete disarmament.

Among the many debates, the debate on article 1(a), “To use or threaten to use nuclear weapons,” was noteworthy. When France wished to add the phrase “except in an extreme circumstance of self-defense, which the very survival of state would be at stake,” Iran stated that such an amendment would change the whole nature of the NWC. The prospect of reaching an agreement seemed bleak until India proposed adding an additional clause to the amendment stating that the only legitimate use of a nuclear weapon would be in retaliation to a nuclear attack. China supported India’s proposal whilst France asked for time to discuss it with NATO members. After concerns raised from the United States, Monday’s final amendment text, written by Brazil, read “A second strike may not be launched from a foreign airbase, especially not from inside a Nuclear-Weapons-Free-Zone.”

For those who wish to learn if negotiations will result in a NWC, a visit to today’s hearings in room E of the North Lawn Building is recommended.
Cluster three

Nuclear energy

• The EU, Czech Republic, UK, and France called on states to accede to all the relevant conventions as soon as possible and to implement fully the ensuing commitments to ensure a satisfactory level of nuclear safety.
• Switzerland would like to see all states adhere to one of the relevant conventions so that a global regime for civil liability can be established.
• Japan announced it has approved a new Strategic Energy Plan on 11 April.
• Austria, Ireland, and New Zealand noted they have rejected nuclear energy as part of their energy mixes.
• Austria argued that nuclear energy can never be 100% safe given risk of accidents and the long-term effects of the nuclear fuel cycle, and said that nuclear power does not contribute to sustainable development or help combat climate change.
• Czech Republic said more focus should be on multilateral projects leading to new environmentally safe and reliable sources of energy.
• Poland announced that in early 2014 it adopted a resolution on the Polish Nuclear Power Program (PNPP) related to measures to be taken to safely start to use nuclear power in Poland.
• Ireland welcomed the ongoing dialogue between interested coastal and shipping states regarding government-to-government communication in the area of maritime transport of radioactive material.
• New Zealand emphasised the importance of highest possible safety and security condition for an accident occurring during the maritime transport of nuclear material.
• New Zealand noted that nuclear emergencies, whether accidental or deliberate, do not respect borders.
• Ireland said that the lack of progress on disarmament has resulted in the third pillar bearing an undue burden and that it therefore need protection with robust safeguards and safety requirements.
• The EU called on states parties to recommend concrete measures to the 2015 RevCon to ensure responsible development of nuclear energy.

Fuel cycle

• Kazakhstan noted that it is currently holding intensive negotiations with the IAEA on the text of the host country for the LEU bank.
• The EU welcomed the steps taken to establish an IAEA low-enriched uranium bank.
• Brazil raised concerns that only civilian nuclear facilities or activities are under multilateral control mechanisms and not stockpiles of nuclear material for military use.
• New Zealand emphasised that all countries using nuclear energy must apply the highest standards of safeguards, safety, and security throughout the complete nuclear fuel cycle.
• France encouraged states to agree on rules of procedures for export of radiological sources, including return to supplier of disused sources.
• Finland cautioned that nuclear waste management is an issue that should be considered from the very beginning of the development of nuclear power programme.
• Iran underlined the importance for them of maintaining a full fuel cycle.
• Namibia hopes to assume other work in the fuel cycle than just mining.

Nuclear safety

• The EU, Canada, Ireland, Switzerland, France, Philippines, and New Zealand underlined the increased attention on nuclear safety after Fukushima in 2011, while Ireland, Switzerland, and New Zealand called for global higher standards in nuclear safety.
• Czech Republic, Australia, and Switzerland underlined the importance of IAEA peer review processes for nuclear security.
• Spain said that progress cannot halt because of a nuclear accident, but there should be greater care to security.
• China has initiated a comprehensive nuclear safety review after Fukushima.
• ROK looked forward to the lessons learned report on the Fukushima Dai-ichi accident.
• Italy announced that, together with the US under the Global Threat Reduction Initiative, it has completed the removal of a significant amount of excess HEU and
separated plutonium from Italy and will continue to work to eliminate additional stocks of special nuclear material.

- Switzerland called on NPT members to negotiate an amendment to strengthen nuclear safety during the 2015 RevCon.

**Nuclear security**
- The EU looked forward to the special meeting of the UN Security Council devoted to the tenth anniversary of resolution 1540 to take place in New York on 7 May 2014.
- Brazil, Japan, and New Zealand welcomed the successful outcome of the 2014 Nuclear Security Summit.
- New Zealand announced that it is preparing to ratify Amendment to Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism.

**Other**
- Brazil welcomed that the IAEA will take an active part in the post-2015 sustainable development goals agenda.
- Czech Republic emphasised the role that the IAEA also plays in nuclear disarmament through safeguards and inspections.
- Malaysia believes that the technical cooperation fund should be integrated into the regular IAEA budget.
- The Philippines recognized the importance of regional cooperation in regulatory control and welcomed the establishment of the ASEAN Regulatory Network.

**Work of PrepCom**
- The Chair announced that the draft Chair’s paper will not be circulated until Tuesday.

---

**REPORT: HEU-LEU AGREEMENT**
*Mia Gandenberger | Reaching Critical Will of WILPF*

On Monday, the United States held a briefing on the results of the US-Russian Agreement Concerning the Disposition of Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) Extracted from Nuclear Weapons. A representative of the Russian State Atomic Energy Corporation (ROSATOM), Mr. V. Kuchinov, and one from the US Department of Energy’s National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), Mr. G. Dwyer, presented their take on the agreement and the joint work over the past twenty years.

In his opening remarks Adam Scheinman, Senior Advisor on International Security and Nonproliferation, highlighted the significance of the project as it demonstrated there are many paths for nuclear disarmament. In this particular case a commercial path had been successful.

In February 1993 the two states had agreed on the disposition of HEU originating from Russian nuclear weapons, that once down-blended to low-enriched uranium (LEU), would be shipped to the US where it to be fabricated in commercial reactors. The agreement had been made between the two governments as well as with commercial agents on each side that conducted most aspects of the implementation. Additionally, Russia and the US agreed on a memorandum of understanding under which both sides could conduct monitoring measures of the others’ implementation of the agreement. The intended transparency was achieved by exchange of documents as well as on-site observations and measurements.

The first shipment to the US left St. Petersburg in May 1995 and while the project was not completed due to some bumps along the road, the final shipment of LEU was made on 14 November 2013. Over the past twenty years, 500 tons of HEU have been converted to LEU, which is approximately equal to 20,000 warheads. Furthermore, 10% of the US’ electricity consumed over the past 15 years was provided by Russian-origin LEU. This will continue to be the case for approximately the following decade.
The Delegation of the European Union to the United Nations

invites you to a discussion on

EU efforts to strengthen nuclear security

Speakers include:

Mr. Jacek Bylica
Principal Adviser and Special Envoy for Non-Proliferation and Disarmament,
European External Action Service

H.E. Mr. Thomas Mayr-Harting
Head of EU Delegation to the United Nations

Ms. Caroline Cliff
Head of UN Section, EU Delegation to the International Organisations in Vienna

Mr. Geoff Shaw
Director of the IAEA Office in New York

Tuesday 6 May 2014
13:15 – 14:30
Conference Room B
United Nations

Refreshments will be offered

Kindly RSVP to: eleanor.vance@eeas.europa.eu
1 In 2005, the Foreign Ministry of which country released a white paper stating that its government would not be the first to use nuclear weapons at any time and under any circumstances?

4 The whole of Latin America, the Caribbean and Africa are in favour of a nuclear weapons convention, along with most nations in Asia, the Pacific and the Middle East. Support is weakest among European and North American nations, many of which are part of ...?

5 What is the name of the strategic nuclear submarine of the French navy that was launched in 2008?

7 In which city did President Obama declare his "vision" for nuclear disarmament in April, 2009?

8 As the only nuclear power to have used a nuclear weapon, what kind of responsibility to act, does Barack Obama think the US has?

9 The South Pacific Nuclear Weapon Free Zone Treaty is also called the Treaty of...?

11 The U.S. have nuclear weapons deployed in ... European NATO member states.

2 Fill in the blank in this Jimmy Carter quote: "For this generation, ours, life is ... survival, liberty is human rights, the pursuit of happiness is a planet whose resources are devoted to the physical and spiritual nourishment of its inhabitants."

3 In the first Review Conference in 1975, the NPT had ... parties.

4 Which state announced its withdrawal from the NPT in 2003?

6 What is the name of the summit, which although talks collapsed, is ultimately seen as having resulted in the 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty?

10 What was the codename of the first nuclear weapon ever tested?
DON’T LET THE OTHER 5 NPT STATES WITH NUCLEAR WEAPONS OFF THE HOOK: BELGIUM, GERMANY, ITALY, THE NETHERLANDS, TURKEY