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Introduction*

Ambassador Woolcott, delegates, Secretariat, and fellow members of civil society,

I am here representing Reaching Critical Will, a project of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, which serves as NGO Coordinator for the participation of civil society in the NPT review cycle and as an NGO liaison with the Secretariat.

Reaching Critical Will and all other NGO representatives are grateful for the opportunity which you have given to civil society to share with you some of its views about the subject of this meeting. Like all of you, we have great expectations on multilateralism and negotiations as the appropriate way of providing security and safety for all humankind.

We have been following the proceedings closely and holding our own educational and advocacy events. This year, 480 individuals from 60 organizations from around the world have been accredited to attend this first Preparatory Committee.

The presentations you are about to hear have been in development since January. Over one hundred NGO representatives have participated in the drafting of some of these statements through a process held mostly online, to facilitate the participation of people working around the world. We are distributing packets of the presentations, which are also available online at www.reachingcriticalwill.org.

We hope the views presented here provide some food for thought in your deliberations. We always welcome feedback, questions, and comments and are happy to engage with delegates at any time. As many of you have pointed out, collaboration and cooperation between governments and civil society has resulted in great achievements on arms control and disarmament issues in the past, and we believe that there are limitless possibilities for the future.

Without further ado, I would like to invite the first speaker of our programme to take the floor, Mayor Taue of Nagasaki.

Thank you.

Mayor of Nagasaki and Vice President of Mayors for Peace*

Mr. Chairman, government representatives, NGO and citizen’s group leaders from around the world, my name is Tomihisa Taue, the Mayor of Nagasaki. I would first like to express my heartfelt gratitude to be given the opportunity to speak here today.

I would also like to extend my thanks to the people all over the world who gave their support in the wake of the March 11th East Japan Earthquake, Tsunami, and Nuclear Disaster.

Sixty-seven years ago in August 1945 atomic bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki killing more than 200,000 citizens. With no regard for non-combatants like women, children, and the elderly, lives were cut short without ever knowing what had occurred. Those who survived suffer even now from the aftereffects of radiation.

In 1982, the mayors of Nagasaki and Hiroshima began the process of uniting in peace with cities around the world to prevent another tragedy caused by the atomic bomb. Today, over 5,000 cities, home to nearly a billion people, have answered the call and pledged their support. So, I stand before you today both as a representative of Mayors for Peace, an organization consisting of leaders committed to protecting their citizens from nuclear weapons, and as a representative of the people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The world is paying careful attention to this 1st Preparatory Committee for the 2015 NPT Review Conference. This meeting is an important first step towards taking a leap forward at the next NPT Review Conference. Today there will be serious discussions on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation as well as the peaceful use of nuclear energy, and I would like to raise four points for consideration by the government representatives in this committee.

First, I urge you all, as human beings, to consider again the inhumanity of atomic weapons. With unanimous agreement, the Final Document from the 2010 NPT Review Conference expresses deep concern for the catastrophic humanitarian consequences from any use of atomic weapons, and all States Parties reaffirmed the need to observe international law.

Because debate on nuclear weapons usually starts and ends with national interests, the balance of military force, and the effectiveness of military technology, I wonder if representatives from the nuclear powers understand the true horror of nuclear weapons.

It is the atomic bomb survivors whose voices bring us back to seeing and discussing the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons and it is imperative that all parties listen to those voices and come to understand why
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they appeal so desperately for a world free of nuclear weapons. Several atomic bomb survivors from Japan are here with us in Vienna now. I urge you to take this chance to listen to their stories and take to heart the cruel inhumanity of these weapons.

My second point is that we must fulfill our responsibility to pass on to future generations a world without nuclear weapons. At the 2010 NPT Review Conference, the first chairman’s draft from Committee One included ground-breaking measures to obligate nuclear powers to make concrete efforts to establish a world free of nuclear weapons and to empower the Secretary General of the UN to convene a meeting as early as 2014 for the creation of a roadmap to the complete abolition of nuclear weapons. This was inspired by Secretary General Ban Ki-moon’s 2008 five-point proposal that included a Nuclear Weapons Convention, and when this proposal was made, we felt we were finally getting closer to our goal.

However, while there were references to the NWC in the Final Document, the part regarding the convening of a meeting for a roadmap was removed. Despite the clear indication of the unanimous desire for a world without nuclear weapons, no concrete timeframes or methods to this end were stated.

Mayors for Peace is calling for immediate preliminary arrangements and the speedy convening of this roadmap meeting. Recently 33 heads of state from Latin America and the Caribbean expressed their strong commitment to work on convening an international high-level conference to set forth a program in stages for the total elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified framework of time.

Leaders of nuclear powers, listen to the voices of civil and international society. We urge you to make efforts at this preliminary conference to ensure that the 2015 NPT Review Conference will become the starting point for the realization of this roadmap meeting and the place to gain the consensus to conclude a Nuclear Weapons Convention. We trust that the 2015 NPT Review Conference will clearly show how and in what timeframe a world without nuclear weapons will be realized.

In addition, treaties concluded among nations have created nuclear-weapon-free zones where the stationing, production, acquisition, possession, and control of nuclear weapons are prohibited. These nuclear-weapon-free zones are one concrete method towards the abolition of nuclear weapons. We have an agreement to hold a meeting for the establishment of such a nuclear-weapon free zone in the Middle East this year. In Northeast Asia, we are faced with the North Korean nuclear issue and are keenly aware of the importance of establishing this nuclear-weapon-free zone. Leaders of the world, let’s work together to create more of these zones to bring us closer to the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons.

For my third point I must once again urge the leaders of nuclear powers to make additional efforts for nuclear disarmament as mandated in Article 6 of the NPT. We ask the leaders of all countries, in particular those of nuclear powers, this: Isn’t it absurd that investing the immense sum of $1.63 trillion dollars worldwide on military expenditures such as in 2010 in the name of national security has only led to a more dangerous world? Is it not time now to display the strong will required to free us from that danger?

Currently, the US and Russia are working to reduce strategically deployed nuclear warheads based on the New START treaty. During his visit to Seoul, Korea for the Nuclear Security Summit held this past march, US President Barack Obama reiterated the points he made three years ago regarding his responsibilities and moral obligations as president of the only country to have used nuclear weapons. Speaking to students at the Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, he not only expressed his intent to propose to Russia the further reduction of strategic arms, but also the desire for dialogue on nuclear issues with China, as well as the desire to solve many other problems regarding nuclear weapons, including the ratification of the CTBT.

Furthermore, reports from Washington indicated that three choices for the reduction of strategic nuclear arms were under consideration, including the possibility of lowering the number of warheads. While we welcome these steps forward, we must urge the US government to fast-track arms reductions and make the decision to completely abolish nuclear weapons as soon as possible.

My fourth and last point is that cooperation among the UN, nuclear and non-nuclear powers, NGOs, and civil society is indispensable for realizing a world without nuclear weapons. At the 2010 NPT Review Conference, 42 governments including Japan stressed the importance of arms reduction and non-proliferation education. As such, the Japanese government will be holding a “Global Forum on Disarmament and Non-Proliferation Education” in Nagasaki this August. Here we can expect lively debate and attendance from many NGOs, government representatives, and specialists from around the world.

Mayors for Peace is currently making arrangements to hold Atomic Bomb Exhibitions around the world during a specified period of time in member cities to commemorate the achievement of exceeding 5,000 members. Participation is possible simply by downloading the materials from our homepage. Speaking now to the many countries that support a world free of nuclear weapons, I urge you to show your support by helping to promote our atomic bomb exhibition initiative. Through these exhibitions, you and your citizens will further understand why we continue to call for the abolition of nuclear weapons.

During this Preparatory Committee meeting, an atomic bomb exhibition will be on display at the Vienna International Centre and it will also be held at Vienna City Hall starting tomorrow. I ask that you take the time to visit one of them.

Kazumi Matsui, mayor of Hiroshima, has been exploring the possibility of holding the NPT Review Conference in Hiroshima City. This would bring the leaders of the nuclear powers to the first city where an atomic bomb was dropped to discuss the abolition of nuclear weapons. I ask you, is there any location more appropriate than
Hiroshima to discuss completely eliminating the threat of nuclear weapons and creating a world without them? Nagasaki will be coordinating with Hiroshima to make this a reality. I ask for your support and cooperation in the realization of this vision.

The actions taken globally in these next few years leading up to the NPT Review Conference in 2015 will go down in history as the steps taken by humankind to overcome the nuclear threat. To those who bear the heavy responsibility of advising your leaders, I call for brave and concrete action towards the Nuclear Weapons Convention. Thank you for your kind attention.

---

**No More Hibakusha**

-- Message of the Hibakusha to Governments of the World --*

Dear distinguished chairperson and government representatives,

I express my sincere gratitude to you all for giving me an opportunity to speak on behalf of the A-bomb survivors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. My name is Mikiso IWASA, I am a survivor of Hiroshima.

As you may know, Japanese people suffered from the damage of A-bomb attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki 67 years ago. We also went through the damage of the US Bikini H-bomb test in 1954. And in 2011, the East Japan Great earthquake, tsunami and the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant disaster occurred, which gave us a shock as we have appealed for no more radiation victims.

This nuclear disaster reminded us of the unprecedented catastrophe caused by the first use of nuclear weapons in human history in the war of 67 years ago, and reinforced our recognition that we humans are still living under the danger of nuclear weapons. The 2010 NPT Review Conference produced an historic outcome to open up prospects for a nuclear weapon-free world. Being present at the start of a new NPT cycle toward 2015, I sincerely want to urge you to implement the agreements of the 2010 NPT and turn this cycle into a process of abolishing nuclear weapons.

On that day, August 6, 1945, I was 1.2 kilometers from the blast center of the A-bomb and I went through a hell on earth. I was 16 years old. The atomic bomb yielded a tremendous destructive power that defies any human imagination, a combination of blast pressure, heat rays and radiation. I was knocked down on the ground, hit by a strong blast that blew with a speed of more than a hundred meters per second, and in the next moment, the city of Hiroshima literally vanished from my field of view. I had never imagined that such a thing could possibly happen on earth, but it just happened.

I found my mother trapped under the collapsed house and tried to pull her out from there, but it was impossible for the young boy I was. Around me turned into a blazing inferno, which was about to engulf me. At the end, I fled from the fire, turning my back to my mother who was saying prayers sensing that she was going to die. Yes, I let her die. She was burnt alive, caught in the fire.

I desperately managed to reach a swimming pool in the schoolyard of a junior high school located behind our house. I jumped into the water and could escape from the fire. I still remember that a man barely reached the schoolyard a little later, but he got burned to death.

A couple of days later, I dug out what looked like my mother’s body from the ruins of our house. It was an object greasy with fat, like a mannequin painted with tar and burned. I could not believe that it was her body. She was killed mercilessly, like an object, not like a human being. The deaths of A-bomb victims in Hiroshima and Nagasaki can hardly be described as “human deaths”.

My younger sister, then a first grader in girls’ middle school, had been mobilized and was working near the blast center when the bomb was dropped. She is still missing. Even today, we do not know where and how she died. Though under extreme wartime conditions, it was a great pity that 12 or 13 year-old children were mobilized to work and were killed so cruelly. I cannot help but feel a strong anger at the war itself and the country that started it as well as at nuclear weapons and the country that used them. Nuclear weapons are inhumane weapons and their use is a violation of international law.

I walked around the city every day looking for my sister. After about a month of this fruitless effort, I fell ill, developing acute radiation symptoms such as reddish purple spots on my limbs and body, bleeding from gums, pain in my throat and fall of hair. Thanks to my aunt’s devoted care, I could get special treatment and recovered miraculously. I was lucky. Because as many as 210,000 people died in Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the end of that year. In addition, many survivors, including those who entered the city after the bombing in search of their relatives or to rescue victims, fell sick like me with acute symptoms or developed leukemia and they died one after another. When the survivors were in helpless condition and badly in need of urgent help and assistance, the U.S. occupation troops and the Japanese government covered up the realities of the atomic bombing and abandoned the survivors to their fate without providing any help. Such attitude of the governments continued for many years. This is a crime against humanity. It should not be forgotten.

In 1954, the U.S. conducted a hydrogen bomb test at the Bikini Atoll in the Pacific and exposed a Japanese fishing boat the Fifth Lucky Dragon to radiation. This incident triggered the rapid development of the Japanese movement for banning A and H bombs and led to the first World Conference against A and H Bombs in 1955. In 1956, the Hibakusha got together and established a national organization, Japan Confederation of A- and H-Bomb Sufferers
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Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates:

We are here in Vienna, a city steeped in history and culture and surrounded by natural beauty, sheltered for the moment from the conflicts that are killing and maiming thousands of people around the world. We are here, in a comfortable city largely removed from such violence, out of a sense of obligation to prevent present and future conflicts from escalating into something far more catastrophic.

Or so we say. As representatives of civil society, we are becoming increasingly frustrated with this ritual of NPT Review Conferences and PrepComs. We can almost predict what will happen. The nuclear-weapon states will characterize their activities as progress on disarmament rather than as the retention of large, modernized arsenals. Many states—nuclear- and non-nuclear alike—will point the finger at Iran and the DPRK rather than stigmatize the weapons themselves in anyone’s hands. Proliferation and alleged proliferation will be discussed in isolation as an obstacle to disarmament rather than as a consequence of the failure to comply fully with Article 6. Some states will change the subject entirely to the global promotion of a dangerous and obsolete technology for producing electricity, as though the NPT were first and foremost the midwife of the nuclear power industry’s dreams of global expansion.

The outcome of the 2010 Review, despite the collegial atmosphere and the sense of relief that the collapse of 2005 was not repeated, made little substantive advance over the 2000 outcome, although the final document did make welcome and overdue reference to the “catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons”. The nuclear-weapon states once again evaded the question of when and how they will fulfill their disarmament commitments under Article 6. Another empty request was made for Israel, India, and Pakistan to join the NPT as non-nuclear-weapon states. And a full quarter of the document’s substantive language dealt with institutional support for an industry that, by its very nature, undermines both the disarmament and the non-proliferation goals of the NPT.

Meanwhile, the consequences of inaction are even more foreseeable now than they were two years ago, when the NPT states parties expressed their “deep concern at the continued risk for humanity represented by the possibility that these weapons could be used.” You spoke with real justification of “catastrophic humanitarian consequences that would result from any use of nuclear weapons,” and we will come to those in a moment. Yet there are immediate consequences of inaction, even before these weapons are used militarily.

Mr. Chairman,

If the impasse over disarmament is not overcome during this Review cycle, we are sure to see a further

Risks and consequences of nuclear weapons and nuclear energy*

* Drafted by John Loretz, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW); John Hallam, People for Nuclear Disarmament Nuclear Flashpoints Project; and Elizabeth Shafer, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy. Delivered by Tilman Ruff, International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN).
Mr. Chairman,

Last November, the Council of Delegates of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement adopted a new resolution, by acclamation, appealing to all States “to ensure that nuclear weapons are never again used, regardless of their views on the legality of such weapons,” and “to pursue in good faith and conclude with urgency and determination negotiations to prohibit the use of and completely eliminate nuclear weapons through a legally binding international agreement, based on existing commitments and international obligations.”

One clear and viable way to implement this resolution would be to transform the nuclear disarmament obligation embodied in Article 6 of the NPT into a global agreement to eliminate and abolish nuclear weapons—what many of the NGOs represented here have called a nuclear weapons convention. Many of us have addressed how this could be done. Why it must be done can only be fully appreciated if we pause to reflect on what the phrase “catastrophic humanitarian consequences,” present in both the 2010 Review document and the Red Cross/Red Crescent resolution, actually means.

Echoing the 1996 advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice, the resolution begins by citing “the destructive power of nuclear weapons, the unspeakable human suffering they cause, the difficulty of controlling their effects in space and time, the threat they pose to the environment and to future generations and the risks of escalation they create.” Indeed, as we learned from the US atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, even a single nuclear explosion over a modern city would indiscriminately kill tens of thousands — even hundreds of thousands — of people immediately. The immediate casualties of a nuclear war in which even a small fraction of today’s arsenals are used would reach into the tens of millions.

Moreover, nuclear weapons eradicate the social infrastructure required for recovery from conflict. Roads and transportation systems, hospitals and pharmacies, fire fighting equipment, and communications would all lie in rubble throughout a zone of complete destruction extending for miles. People in neighboring and distant countries having nothing to do with the conflict would suffer from the effects of radioactive fallout, even if they were at a safe distance from the blast and thermal destruction near ground zero. Nuclear weapons explosions also have extreme and long-lasting environmental consequences, including disruption of the Earth’s climate and agricultural productivity.

This disproportionate and indiscriminate destructiveness is clearly a violation of international humanitarian law, as was detailed in the Vancouver Declaration initiated by civil society and released in 2011. Endorsed by leading legal scholars, the declaration states: “The conventions banning chemical and biological weapons refer to them as ‘weapons of mass destruction.’ WMD are, by definition, contrary to the fundamental rules of international humanitarian law forbidding the infliction of indiscriminate harm and unnecessary suffering. [T]hat label is best deserved by nuclear weapons with their uncontrollable blast, heat and radiation effects.”

Mr. Chairman,

There is a great deal of anxiety in this room over what might happen were Iran to acquire a nuclear arsenal, or if the DPRK were to use its program to further the spread of nuclear weapons around the world, or if one state or another decided to abandon its non-proliferation commitment, possibly opening wider the floodgates. As representatives of civil society, we certainly share those concerns, and we recall to your attention that in January the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, with 18 Nobel laureates on its Board of Sponsors, announced, for these reasons among others, that they had moved the minute hand of the Doomsday Clock forward from six to five minutes to midnight.

In our view, however, there is not nearly enough anxiety about the existing nuclear arsenals (in particular the massive stockpiles of US and Russian weapons that still comprise 95% of the world total), the consequences of their possession and use, and the dangerous message they send about the political value of nuclear weapons.

If one bomb can destroy a city, the consequences of a war involving many nuclear explosions are on a scale larger than anything we have experienced previously in human history. India and Pakistan, which tested nuclear weapons and began to build their arsenals in 1998, now have an estimated 160-190 nuclear weapons between them. A classified Pentagon study conducted in 2002 projected that 12 million people would be killed outright in a nuclear war between India and Pakistan. Many additional millions would sustain injuries similar to those seen in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Fallout from ground bursts would expose tens of millions more to lethal levels of ionizing radiation.

An India-Pakistan nuclear conflict involving 100 Hiroshima-sized bombs — a very small fraction of the world’s arsenal - would disrupt the Earth’s climate, causing precipitous drops in temperature and reductions in rainfall worldwide. These climate effects would have significant and long-lasting implications for agriculture and food supplies. A new research study published just last week by IPPNW shows a 10% reduction in corn and rice production in North America and China, lasting a decade or more, and caused by a nuclear war confined to a region far from those agricultural centers, using a relatively small number of weapons. The worst case, which cannot be ruled out as long as these weapons exist, is a nuclear exchange between the US and Russia, in which hundreds of millions of people would be killed immediately and the Earth’s climate and other fundamental ecosystems would collapse in what has been called a nuclear winter, threatening the survival of all humanity and many other complex lifeforms. Again, we will pass over the details, which
fill many reports that we have made available to you, and appeal to you to focus on what that evidence adds up to.

If a regional nuclear war between India and Pakistan were to result in the projected climate disruption and the significant radioactive contamination of one or more major food-producing countries, failed harvests combined with the necessity to take significant areas of crop land out of production would create global famine conditions. If such famine persisted for a year or more, it seems reasonable to fear that the total global death toll could exceed one billion from starvation alone.

Yet the 100 atomic bombs detonated in this hypothetical India-Pakistan conflict represent less than one tenth of 1% of the explosive power now contained in the nuclear arsenals deployed by the US and Russia, and less than one half of 1% of the number of weapons. Together the two countries have nearly 2,000 warheads ready for rapid launch, an operational posture that makes an accidental apocalypse not only possible, but in light of the numerous and terrifying near misses over the decades, leaves one asking if it might not be inevitable. There is no avoiding the fact that the nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the US and Russia have the capacity to make the world uninhabitable in less than an hour, whether by deliberate launch, error, miscalculation or cyber-sabotage.

Early last December President Medvedev announced that “the Russian Federation…will employ modern, offensive weapon systems…ensuring our ability to take out any part of the missile defence system in Europe.” Were Russia to “take out” these missile defenses, might not such an action lead to nuclear conflict between the U.S. and Russia? Do we want to find out?

Mr. Chairman,

This very abbreviated summary of the medical, humanitarian, and environmental consequences of the use of nuclear weapons is irrefutable proof that their continued existence is incompatible with the security and survival of everyone on Earth. Yet even if a nuclear weapon were never again exploded over a city and its people, there are consequences to the production, testing, and deployment of nuclear arsenals that are experienced as an ongoing, personal and community catastrophe to those who have been and continue to be harmed by the preparations for nuclear war.

The front end of the nuclear chain—the mining and processing of uranium that provides the fuel for nuclear weapons—has devastating health consequences for those who work in the mines and mills and for their families. Shamefully, the workforce for these dangerous and health-destroying occupations is largely drawn from marginalized and vulnerable communities who are typically uninformed (or misinformed) about the dangers of exposure to radiation and toxic substances, are sent to work with inadequate protective equipment, and are poorly cared for when they develop exposure-related illnesses.

Between 120 and 153 million curies of iodine-131 were released into the atmosphere by the 215 aboveground US nuclear tests between 1945 and 1962. The fallout from those tests, according to the US National Cancer Institute and the Institute of Medicine has been responsible for tens of thousands of excess cases of thyroid cancer. Between 1949 and 1989, the former Soviet Union conducted 116 atmospheric nuclear explosions at its Semipalatinsk test site. The incidence of cancer among residents in eastern Kazakhstan, who received the greatest exposures to radiation, is 25-30 percent higher than elsewhere in the country.

The industrial sites in the US, the former Soviet Union, and other countries where nuclear weapons and the fissile material to fuel them have been manufactured are among the most contaminated places on Earth. Workers at nuclear weapons production facilities have suffered disproportionately from cancers and other illnesses, including leukemia, lymphoma, and cancers of the prostate, kidney, salivary glands, and lungs. The problem of nuclear waste, whether from weapons production or commercial reactors, is compounded by the absence of options for safe, reliable, long term storage over the geological aeons of time required.

Mr. Chairman and Distinguished Delegates,

We feel obliged to remind you that Japan and the rest of the world are still reeling from the nuclear reactor disaster at Fukushima, which has released the largest quantities of radioactive isotopes into the environment since the 1986 Chernobyl disaster. The human, environmental, and economic toll of Fukushima is a terrible reminder that the damage and suffering caused by the meltdown of one or more commercial nuclear reactors merely hints at what would happen if one or more nuclear weapons were exploded over one or more modern cities.

The twin attempts to provide security with nuclear weapons and to meet global energy needs with nuclear power share the same flawed premise: that we can prevent the most dangerous technologies ever created by human hands from ever failing. The premise regarding nuclear weapons is that deterrence works and will never fail. The premise with nuclear energy is that plant designs and safeguards keep getting better, and will stop failing. Neither premise holds up to scrutiny or to experience. The lesson of Hiroshima and Nagasaki is that nuclear weapons must be abolished before they abolish us. The lesson of Fukushima—and of Chernobyl before that—is that we can no longer afford to roll the dice on a technology that cannot be allowed to fail, when failures are inevitable, with catastrophic consequences.

One final humanitarian consequence of nuclear weapons that cannot be overlooked is the enormous diversion of resources into the research and development, production, and deployment of warheads and their delivery systems, at the expense of real human and social needs that are inexcusably underfunded. Global Zero estimates that world spending on nuclear weapons surpasses $100 billion every year. By contrast, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute has estimated that it would take $135 billion annually to fully achieve the Millennium Development Goals. Instead, each nuclear-armed state is engaging in large, expensive programs to modernize its nuclear forces and to ensure that they will continue to endanger us all for decades to come.

For the first time in the 40-year history of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the NPT member states in 2010 explicitly referred to negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention as a way to fulfill the nuclear disarmament obligation
Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates:

I am pleased and privileged to address this Committee.

International civil society has high expectations at the dawn of a new review cycle for the most consequential arms control agreement in history: the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. We see this as a renewed opportunity for the international community to take concrete steps toward the complete elimination of nuclear weapons—without exceptions or exemptions—and to display the genuine political will necessary to see these steps through.

The expectation of progress toward the elimination of nuclear weapons is neither new nor outside the scope of the Treaty. Quite the contrary: the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons lies at the very heart of the NPT’s raison d’être and remains a foundational objective of the United Nations more than six decades after its creation. But to achieve this goal, states must go beyond diplomatic formalities and provide unequivocal political, technical and financial support for nuclear disarmament as a shared objective in the best interest of all nations.

Unfortunately, however, the international community has allowed this issue to drift endlessly without resolution despite overwhelming evidence that nuclear weapons lack any legal, political, military or moral justification.

Our conviction that nuclear weapons must and can be eliminated is not based on a naive or crude understanding of international relations. Civil society organizations are fully aware that some states enshrine nuclear weapons in their national security doctrines and strategies. But the case has been made, from several disciplines, repeatedly and convincingly, that any perceived benefits of nuclear weapons possession are based on fallacious paradigms and, in any case, are far outweighed by the threat posed by these weapons to civilization itself.

It is thus imperative to begin conscientious work toward a global, legal ban on the development, possession, and use of nuclear weapons without further delay. Under the NPT, every state party has a responsibility to ensure that these negotiations both begin and come to a conclusion. The details of disarmament and verification aspects, as well as timelines can all be worked out through the process—that is the very purpose of negotiations. But they must begin now. Such a ban, which is long overdue, would address the two primary concerns straining the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime: the actual possession of nuclear weapons by a few states, and the desire of others to emulate such behaviour and pursue nuclear weapons of their own.

Mr. Chairman,

Vague declarations affirming support in principle for the eventual goal of a world free of nuclear weapons do not suffice. That page has been turned. There is near-universal agreement that no justification exists to subject humanity to the existential risk posed by these weapons. Actual work to move this issue forward would include a timeline or provisions for the needed political, technical and legal preparations. This forum, at a minimum, must recognize that nuclear weapons pose an unacceptable threat to humanity and must therefore be eliminated. Reiterations of this fact are not evidence of renewed political will to advance the nuclear disarmament agenda.

While there is widespread agreement in principle on the end goal, we are deeply concerned that the process to achieve it has failed to bear fruit. Despite countless exhortations from the highest levels to begin their negotiating responsibilities, the Conference on Disarmament has, once again, failed to agree on a program of work. The time has come to examine other avenues that can deliver a global, legal ban on nuclear weapons.

After more than 40 years of the Treaty’s existence, the promise of nuclear disarmament still seems out of reach. And copious amounts of money—an estimated 1 trillion USD over the next 10 years—are being spent to modernize nuclear weapons systems. Qualitative improvements are not disarmament. There are more nuclear-armed states today than there were when the Treaty was signed. Holdout states still block the Treaty’s aspiration to universality. Clandestine attempts have been made to acquire nuclear weapons and proliferation concerns continue to strain the nuclear disarmament regime. The only way to ensure that the goals enshrined in the Treaty more than 40 years ago are achieved is to commence negotiations on a comprehensive, global ban on nuclear weapons.

Despite assertions to the contrary by some states, preparatory work for a legal ban on nuclear weapons is not premature. Real progress on this issue cannot be further postponed. After decades of waiting for all pillars of the Treaty to be strictly upheld, the need and impetus for all states parties to take concrete steps toward nuclear disarmament are anything but ‘premature’.

Mr. Chairman,

We have witnessed in disappointment how NPT review cycles have come and gone with little change in the business-as-usual attitude of nuclear-weapons states regarding the blatant disregard for their obligation to disarm. And agreements that are hailed as positive outcomes of these Conferences are often a reiteration of vague principles and

---
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existing obligations that do little more than perpetuate the nuclear status quo.

The 2010 Review Conference, for example, was hailed by many as a success as it produced a Final Document, which notably contained a section cleverly called an “Action Plan.” However, with few exceptions, the items in this plan either do not constitute actions or refer to pre-existing obligations.

Action 1, for example, asks states to “pursue policies that are fully compatible with the Treaty”—an obvious prior obligation by virtue of membership in the NPT. Action 3 calls on nuclear weapon states to undertake further efforts to “ultimately eliminate” nuclear weapons. Ultimately—a qualifier so vague it liberates NWS from any immediate obligation.

Action 20 urges states to “submit regular reports” as part of the NPT’s review process. This is a pre-existing obligation that is nonetheless inconsistently followed. Compliance with reporting obligations not only enhances transparency but advances the notion that all NPT states parties are accountable for their efforts to implement the Treaty. Action 61 “encourages states, on a voluntary basis, to minimize civilian HEU stocks where technically and economically feasible.” In this case, carefully included caveats make the prospect of actual compliance unacceptably low.

Despite past failures, we must see the beginning of the 2015 Review Cycle as an opportunity to break from past timidity and take concerted actions that can lay a strong foundation for a global ban on nuclear weapons.

Mr. Chairman,

Several concerns merit increased attention in the review cycle that begins this year:

To start, the problematic disarmament/non-proliferation nexus needs to be fully recognized. The pervasive notion that the primary problem of nuclear weapons is the risk of their proliferation, and not their very existence, cannot be further perpetuated. To be absolutely clear: the main problem with the existence of nuclear weapons is the existence of nuclear weapons. Proliferation concerns are important and legitimate, but they will never be fully allayed unless the responsibility to disarm is taken seriously by NWS. States that continue to cling to the dubious doctrine of nuclear deterrence are clearly not living up to their NPT commitments, and it is imperative that they abide by the obligation to disarm under Article VI of the Treaty.

The discriminatory nature of the NPT is untenable. We reject the lopsided logic by which the very states that have developed, stockpiled, tested, and used nuclear weapons deem themselves fit to chastise others on the risks of proliferation. The moral high ground claimed by NWS is built upon an extremely weak and inherently unjust foundation.

The imbalance between disarmament and non-proliferation obligations is highly problematic, and the former cannot be understood to be a mere exhortation while the latter is a hard obligation. The double standard perpetuated by nuclear weapon states’ unwillingness to irreversibly disarm weakens otherwise valid concerns about proliferation dangers. It generates strong proliferation pressures. And it creates disincentives for non-nuclear weapon states to continue adhering to their non-proliferation commitments.

We are also highly skeptical of the discriminatory approach used by NWS in their efforts to prevent proliferation. While these states impose harsh economic sanctions and even threaten preemptive military strikes against those merely suspected of pursuing a nuclear weapons capability, they turn a blind eye to the undisputed, illicit and continued development and possession of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems by others that remain outside the Treaty. Such policies undermine not only the very foundation of the NPT, but the peace, security, and international law of the world community. Beyond the specific obligations contained in the Treaty, the discriminatory nature of the broader nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime offends a fundamental sense of justice and equality among nations.

The NPT’s aspirations to universality have been weakened by the actions of some states that have put commercial interests before the spirit and precepts of the Treaty. NWS have engaged, with the questionable sanction of the Nuclear Suppliers Group, in nuclear cooperation agreements with countries outside of the NPT. It defies logic that the NSG would allow an exemption that would, in effect, ‘reward’ a country that is neither a member of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty nor a signatory of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. This sets a troubling precedent. When others choose to engage in similar behaviour it will be hard to argue that such dealings could heighten regional tensions and undermine the aspirations to universality of the NPT, when the same conduct has already been previously allowed.

Restrictions on transfers of sensitive technology are a way to enhance and sustain the non-proliferation regime - and to create the conditions for comprehensive nuclear disarmament. The Nuclear Suppliers Group agreed in 2011 to strengthen guidelines governing the transfer of nuclear fuel cycle facilities, including the adoption of an additional protocol by receiving countries. However, NSG guidelines are just that- guidelines- that are not binding, or universally accepted, nor do they restrict transfers of enrichment or reprocessing technology. Much better would be a policy to discourage acquisition of enrichment and reprocessing technology, which of course can be used to make materials for bombs as well as reactors. One major supplier, the United States, adopted such a policy in 2009 in relation to nuclear trade agreements, only recently to backtrack due to competitive pressures. The commercial interests of the nuclear industry cannot be allowed to override non-proliferation and disarmament objectives. Further, in developing a comprehensive disarmament regime, provision must be made for multilateral control of nuclear fuel production rigorously and equally applied to all states involved.

As we move toward a global legal ban on nuclear weapons, the pursuit of related goals, such as the ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, or negotiations on a fissile materials treaty is welcome and encouraged. But such pursuits cannot be allowed to impede progress on the ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament. The contention that achieving success in processes such as CTBT ratification or FMCT negotiations are a necessary precondition for
preparatory work for a ban on nuclear weapons is essentially flawed. The misguided requirement for a strict sequence must give way to parallel processes that advance various agendas, including preparatory work for the end goal itself.

Mr. Chairman,

The U.S. and Russia maintain over 1,000 mainly silo-based warheads that can be launched in less than two minutes - the same high-alert status they had at the height of the Cold War. But the Cold War ended more than two decades ago. Today, when the international community is more interconnected than ever and various mechanisms are in place to address international disagreements peacefully, there is absolutely no justification for keeping these arsenals on hair-trigger alert.

A number of documented computer glitches and human errors over the years have resulted in false warnings of nuclear attack. In these cases, an unintended nuclear war has been prevented only by hasty decisions by military personnel and political leaders under the severe pressure of a dreadfully brief time window.

This concern is anything but new. Going back more than a decade, several resolutions at the UN General Assembly have called for de-alerting. Most recently, in 2010 a resolution by Switzerland, Malaysia, Nigeria, New Zealand, and Chile on operational readiness achieved an overwhelming majority vote of 157-3. As well, the call for de-alerting, or lowering operational readiness, figured prominently in the Final Document of the last Review Conference. The lowering of alert status of nuclear forces to maximize presidential and senior military decision-making time would dramatically lessen the possibility of an accidental nuclear catastrophe.

Mr. Chairman,

The 28 heads of state and government of NATO countries will soon meet in Chicago. One of their tasks at this summit is to adopt a Defence and Deterrence Posture Review—an analysis of the ‘appropriate mix’ of nuclear weapons, conventional weapons, missile defence, and arms control needed to meet future security challenges. It is disconcerting to see that U.S. nuclear weapons continue to be forward deployed in Non-Nuclear Weapons States. The acquiescence of these NNWS to this arrangement and the training of their pilots to drop nuclear bombs belonging to NWS run contrary to the letter and intent of Article II under the NPT. Likewise, the stationing of nuclear weapons in NNWS constitutes a clear violation of the non-transfer duty of NWS under Article I of the Treaty. NATO nuclear sharing policies are a clear and easily removed obstruction on the path to a nuclear weapons free world.

Non-nuclear weapon states that rely on positive security assurances from nuclear weapons states have a responsibility to reduce the role that nuclear weapons play in their national security strategies. Although not officially NWS, these states are materially complicit in the perpetuation of security doctrines that justify the continued existence of nuclear weapons. We call upon them to formulate security arrangements that do not rely on nuclear weapons or nuclear deterrence and to take immediate steps to remove nuclear weapons from their territory. As well, NATO should end its policy of nuclear sharing so that the 25 members of the alliance who do not have their own nuclear weapons can return to compliance with the treaty.

Mr. Chairman,

We hope that all national delegates present share our view that a world free of nuclear weapons is not a vague and distant aspiration, but a concrete goal that can be achieved in our lifetime. We therefore urge all states represented at this committee to embrace the opportunity, indeed the urgent need, to respond to the groundswell of support for a nuclear weapons-free world from all corners of the globe, and to fully comply with their obligations under the Treaty.

In particular, we urge all states that are in full compliance with the Treaty—the vast majority of NPT states parties—to firmly demand concrete steps toward nuclear disarmament from the very few that would hold the world hostage. We trust that states are empowered by the far-reaching global support for disarmament and call upon them expend all necessary political capital, economic leverage, and any other peaceful means of persuasion to demand that NWS take their nuclear disarmament obligation seriously and all parties are in full compliance with the Treaty. Nuclear disarmament must constitute a foreign policy priority for all nations. The stakes are that high. The cause is that worthy.

The intention of civil society is not to be adversarial in this process, which we stand ready to assist. But in capitals around the world there must be a clear recognition that our call for concrete progress toward a world free of nuclear weapons constitutes the exercising of a fundamental right to hold governments accountable. We are not a haphazard group of superfluous spectators, and our interest in this matter is neither random nor capricious. We represent the views and beliefs of important segments of the constituencies of the elected governments represented here today.

Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Delegates:

The calls to address the fundamental injustices underpinning this Treaty and for nuclear disarmament are getting louder and more persistent. The urgent need of a global legal ban of nuclear weapons has been justified in ample measure by scientists, legal scholars, mayors and parliamentarians, as well as active and retired diplomats and statesmen, from both nuclear-armed and non-nuclear weapons states. It is high time the international community listen to their collective wisdom. We will continue to urge progress and scrutinize results. And decision makers will be increasingly held accountable by their constituents for their failure to act. As they should be.

Thank you very much.
Distinguished delegates,

Here in this hall, you speak not as individuals, but on behalf of nations. You speak as representatives of your citizens. Yet, in most cases, the statements you deliver fail to convey the public’s overwhelming desire for urgent, united action to eradicate nuclear arms. And, very often, they conceal the alarming reality that nations continue to invest heavily in their nuclear arsenals at the expense of human security, that after decades of talk we remain just a hair’s-breadth from unparalleled catastrophe.

Distinguished delegates,

When will nuclear-armed nations and their allies accept what has long been obvious to ordinary people everywhere – that banning the bomb is not an option, but an urgent necessity; that business as usual is unsustainable? Three in four nations now accept that the time has come to negotiate a nuclear weapons ban. We implore each of you: Do not await the incineration of a city; do not await a plume of radioactive fallout that spans the hemispheres; do not await a humanitarian and environmental disaster of unprecedented proportions – before finally mustering the will to eliminate man’s most evil creation.

Governments have a clear popular mandate to act. For sixty-seven years, people everywhere have mobilized against the bomb, demanding an end to the insanity of threatening to annihilate entire nations. Yet, although polls show that support for a nuclear-weapon-free world has never been stronger, we see little action to abolish these monstrous devices. Instead, we see billions of dollars, pounds, euros, yuan, and rubles being squandered on the modernization of nuclear forces, diverting public wealth away from meeting human needs. When will this stop?

Distinguished delegates,

Since we last addressed this forum in New York two years ago, civil society has continued to mobilize for the complete abolition of nuclear weapons, rejecting, as ever, the apocalyptic tendencies of certain governments. One notable development was the adoption last November of a landmark resolution by Red Cross and Red Crescent societies that urged states to negotiate an international agreement to prohibit and eliminate nuclear arms. As the world’s largest humanitarian organization, with close to 100 million staff and volunteers globally, and a long history of neutrality and political independence, the Red Cross is well placed to use humanitarian diplomacy to help bring the nuclear weapons era to an end.

Other groups have drawn attention to the fundamental incompatibility of nuclear weapons with international law. In March of last year the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms and The Simons Foundation released the Vancouver Declaration, “Law’s Imperative for the Urgent Achievement of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World”, signed by numerous eminent experts in law and diplomacy. The declaration holds that it cannot be lawful to continue indefinitely to possess weapons which are unlawful to use or threaten to use, are already banned for most states, and are subject to an obligation of elimination.

Through the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, Global Zero, Abolition 2000, and other campaigns and networks, people are re-orienting themselves, uniting under a common theme – under the right type of umbrella – to achieve together what could not be achieved alone, to create an unstoppable, irresistible groundswell of public support for a universal ban on nuclear weapons. In Canada, more than 600 prominent citizens, among them Nobel laureates and renowned physicians, have petitioned the government to initiate negotiations for a nuclear weapons convention. A similar appeal in Australia garnered the support of past prime ministers, governors-general, military chiefs, actors, artists, authors, scientists, businesspeople and sporting legends.

In the nuclear-armed states, disarmament campaigners continue to challenge costly nuclear weapons modernization programmes, which run counter to the universal obligation to pursue and achieve nuclear abolition. In the United States – which spends more on its nuclear forces than all other nations combined – legal and political battles are under way to thwart construction of three new nuclear bomb factories. Dozens of protesters, some of them elderly, have been arrested and imprisoned for their courageous efforts to close down nuclear facilities and prevent deployment and testing of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. And there are signs that a new and powerful student-led movement to ban the bomb is emerging.

In Britain, disarmament advocates have ramped up efforts to stop government plans to replace the nation’s ageing fleet of nuclear-armed submarines – and redirect public funds towards education, health care and jobs. French campaigners have held hunger strikes to put pressure on their government to disarm. And right across Europe, activists are demanding the withdrawal, at long last, of US battlefield nuclear arms from the continent – a dangerous legacy of the cold war. Their efforts are part of a broader campaign, encompassing Australia, Canada, Japan and South Korea, to end allied support for the expansive US nuclear war-fighting apparatus.

In South Asia, Indian and Pakistani campaigners have been working tirelessly to halt the potentially catastrophic nuclear arms race under way between their nations. And in the Middle East, as tensions escalate over Iran’s disputed nuclear programme and Israel’s undeclared arsenal, peace and disarmament advocates are uniting to demand dialogue and denounced military action. Activists from the Israeli Disarmament Movement have demonstrated in the streets to voice their support for a diplomatic resolution, and the Japanese Peace Boat has provided a neutral venue for discussions on pathways to a nuclear-weapon-free world. Dozens of groups in Japan continue their campaign for prompt negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention.
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The presence of nuclear weapons in this world leaves us with two possible futures: in the best case scenario, states continue to own weapons that will never be used. In the worst case scenario, these weapons could be used at all times. We reject both futures, for nuclear weapons should simply not exist.

Mr. Chairman, the very first resolution of the UN General Assembly established the objective to prohibit the possession of nuclear weapons as a top priority of the international community. Then the Cold War broke out, and the two superpowers developed the concept of nuclear deterrence. It is not surprising that the resulting military doctrine was called MAD. The Cold War is now over and deterrence is an outdated justification for the existence of such weapons.

Today, we feel the danger and risk of nuclear weapons more than ever. The source of our fears and frustrations are the chief executives of arms manufacturers.

Distinguished delegates,

Let me turn now to the other nuclear threat: nuclear power. The Japanese public last year forced their government to commit to shutting down its nuclear reactors. Thousands of campaigners formed human chains, kilometres long, that linked the power plants. Similar protests have taken place in France and elsewhere across Europe. Italians voted resoundingly against nuclear power in a referendum, and just over a month ago, at a conference in Mali on uranium mining, activists from around Africa declared, in no uncertain terms, that the future is renewable, not radioactive.

Distinguished delegates,

For those in this room representing governments that believe they have a right to possess and threaten to use nuclear weapons at their will, for those in this room who believe that their nation’s security is enhanced through its support for an ally’s nuclear weapons programme, for those in this room who think that acquiring the bomb might bring them security, for this in this room who refuse to see the nexus between nuclear weapons and nuclear power – let there be no mistake: the people of the world are against you. The people’s verdict is clear: abolish nuclear weapons now. End this madness once and for all.

Disarmament is not an optional extra of the NPT. It is your legal duty. It is your moral responsibility. It is the loud, urgent, persistent plea of people across the globe. Help us make this the new and better reality. We owe it to the victims of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, of the Marshall Islands, French Polynesia and the Sahara, of Three Mile Island, Chernobyl and Fukushima, and of other irradiated lands, to do everything in our power to ensure that they are the last, that no one else shall ever suffer as they have suffered. So, distinguished delegates, what will it take? What will it take to ensure that the nuclear era ends, not in cities smouldering, but in worldwide celebration?

Thank you.
lies in the same events that have recently challenged the goals of the NPT.

We, the youth, fear an arms race in several regions of the world and the unchecked proliferation of nuclear weapons.

We, the youth, sit, frustrated as we continue to witness the lack of political will and trust needed to confront these obstacles.

It is crucial to build trust among states by prioritizing the elimination of rapidly deployable nuclear weapons. These weapons can destroy entire cities or countries in a few hours. Increasing trust would mean that states tempted to build new weapons would be universally accountable to the international community.

There is a man who has used nuclear weapons and is now engaging against them. His name is Robert Green, he is a former Commander of the Royal Navy and now one of the staunchest advocates of nuclear abolition. We can all learn from his experience.

There are also those who have survived the use of these terrible weapons. They are the victims and witnesses of the only weapons that could destroy our planet. Hibakushas bring on their dignified fight against them, well aware of their risks. They are a living warning against the worst form of death conceived by humankind, and to ignore them is to ignore the worst risk that humanity could face.

We live in the world of the Third Industrial Revolution, with an increasing power of communication and online interaction. As a result, we are all linked to each other.

How do you justify the existence, development and maintenance of these weapons in a world where your children and grandchildren do not see the difference between an Asian and European boy, between an American and an African girl? And how do you justify them in a world hit by the worst economic crisis since 1929, where youth unemployment is increasingly designing our instable future?

Representatives of the world's nations, how do you justify maintaining nuclear weapons in such a context? Is this the world that you want to hand down to younger generations?

We, as young people, care a lot about the future of this planet. We are aware that differences of cultures, religions, and political constraints persist. But we will not give up our fight against nuclear weapons.

Do not ignore our concern! Remember your humanity, and forget the rest.

Thank you very much for your attention.

The role of parliamentarians to advance nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament*

Your Excellencies, representatives of civil society, ladies and gentlemen,

In February 2010, United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon sent a letter to every parliament in the world highlighting the vital role that parliaments and parliamentarians play in nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament.

He noted that

Parliaments support the implementation of treaties and global agreements contributing to the rule of law and promoting adherence to commitments. They adopt legislation that increases transparency and accountability, thus building trust, facilitating verification and creating conditions that are conducive to the further pursuit of disarmament.

I would therefore like to take this opportunity to encourage all parliamentarians to join in efforts to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world. In particular, I call upon parliamentarians to increase their support for peace and disarmament, to bring disarmament and nonproliferation treaties into force, and to start work now on the legislative agendas needed to achieve and sustain the objective of nuclear disarmament.

Parliaments and parliamentarians around the world have responded positively to this call, and also to the Five-Point Plan for Nuclear Disarmament that the UNSG released on United Nations Day 2008, which included an appeal to States Parties to the NPT to fulfill their disarmament obligations by negotiating a nuclear weapons convention or framework of separate, mutually reinforcing instruments.

Parliamentarians from across the political spectrum have endorsed a Joint Statement Supporting a Nuclear Weapons Convention, introduced resolutions, supporting the UNSG’s plan and the Nuclear Weapons Convention, that have been adopted—mostly by consensus—in a number of parliaments including Austria, Bangladesh, Canada, Costa Rica, European Parliament, Germany, Italy, Mexico and New Zealand. Most significantly the Inter-Parliamentary Union, which comprises most of the world’s parliaments, including a majority of the Nuclear Weapon States and their allies, adopted a resolution by consensus supporting the UNSG’s Five-Point Plan.

Parliaments and parliamentarians have spoken. It’s time for governments to act, in particular to implement the agreement you made in 2010 that “All States need to make special efforts to establish the necessary framework to achieve and maintain a world without nuclear weapons.”

No-one expects that negotiations for a Nuclear Weapons Convention or package of agreements will be easy, but that is no excuse for not starting now. If one or two countries continue to block progress at the Conference on Disarmament (CD) – as they have done for 16 years now – then governments have an obligation to start work elsewhere. You can always swing it back into the CD if it becomes unblocked.

Of course, starting negotiations on a Nuclear Weapons Convention or framework does not alleviate the urgent

* Presented by Jana Jedličková, Parliamentarians for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament, Czech Republic
need for measures and steps which can be achieved immediately or in the medium term, including ratification and Entry-into-force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, stockpile reductions by all nuclear-weapons-possessing States, taking all nuclear forces off high operational readiness (high alert and launch-on-warning), banning the production of fissile materials, lowering the role of nuclear weapons in security doctrines, establishing additional nuclear-weapon-free zones, building verification capacities, implementing confidence-building measures and strengthening the legal norm against any use of nuclear weapons.

Parliamentarians and parliaments play a vital role in advancing, discussing, publicizing, financing, building political momentum for, and implementing such measures.

As UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon noted in his letter to all parliaments:

At a time when the international community is facing unprecedented global challenges, parliamentarians can take on leading roles in ensuring sustainable global security, while reducing the diversion of precious resources from human needs. As parliaments set the fiscal priorities for their respective countries, they can determine how much to invest in the pursuit of peace and cooperative security. Towards this end, parliaments can establish the institutional infrastructures to support the development of necessary practical measures.

Parliamentarians have thus taken action on a number of the other measures agreed at the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

On the NPT call for a conference in 2012 on establishing a Middle East Zone Free from Nuclear Weapons and other Weapons of Mass Destruction, parliamentarians from the Middle East and around the world have endorsed a Parliamentary Statement supporting the 2012 Conference and calling on all governments from the region (and other key governments) to participate in good faith in the conference and in the ongoing process to establish the zone. This diplomatic approach to resolving tensions in the region is much preferable to the threat or use of force – which could have unforeseeable consequences. Such a diplomatic approach is the only sustainable way to prevent proliferation.

We take this opportunity to formally present the Joint Parliamentary Statement for a Middle East Zone free from Nuclear Weapons and other Weapons of Mass Destruction (attached as an appendix) to the 2012 NPT Preparatory Committee Meeting, and request that you note this in the official records of the meeting.

Parliamentarians from North East Asia are working on a cross-party basis for a North East Asian NWFZ, in conjunction with the recently established Asia-Pacific Leadership Network for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament. Parliamentarians from the circumpolar nations are working for an Arctic Nuclear Weapon Free Zone as part of building cooperative security mechanisms in a region with increasing potential for conflict arising from the consequences of climate change.

Parliamentarians from NATO countries are urging a lowering of the role of nuclear weapons in the NATO security doctrine, and action on the remaining nuclear weapons deployed in otherwise non-nuclear countries.

Parliamentarians from nuclear weapon States are calling on their governments to lower (or even eliminate) the role of nuclear weapons in their doctrines and reduce (or eliminate) the considerable budgets currently dedicated to nuclear weapons programs. At about US$100 billion annually, the global nuclear weapons budget is approximately 20 times the regular UN budget – a fundamentally perverse reflection of government priorities. One example of legislative action is the Sensible Approach to Nuclear Expenditure (SANE) Act recently submitted to the US Congress by PNND Co-President Ed Markey. It has already garnered support from over seventy other US legislators and thirty major US peace and disarmament organisations.

Parliamentarians are acting as the duly elected representatives of civil society – and thus make these calls to governments on behalf of the civil society constituents we represent. Governments have a duty and obligation to act. It’s time to stop making excuses and start the negotiations for a global treaty or package of agreements to prohibit and eliminate nuclear weapons under strict and effective international control.

Thank you.

---

**New Agenda Coalition NGOs**

We welcome the *Review of the operation of the Treaty* and the *Conclusions and recommendations for follow-on actions (Action Plan)* adopted at the 2010 NPT Review Conference. We make the following observations and recommendations relating to implementation of 2010 NPT Action Plan.

**Disarmament**

*Stockpile reductions*

We commend the US and Russia for concluding and ratifying the new START replacement agreement, while noting that it only commits the two countries to modest reductions of deployed strategic nuclear weapons. We call on the US and

---
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Russia to speedily conclude a new round of stockpile reductions that should lower aggregate stockpiles of nuclear weapons to under 1000. We call on all nuclear-armed states to undertake unilateral reductions in their respective arsenals, and to commence mutual, plurilateral disarmament negotiations.

**Nuclear doctrine**

Nuclear deterrence strategies preclude the prohibition of nuclear weapons. The majority of NPT member States have rejected nuclear deterrence doctrines for their security. It’s time for nuclear-armed states and their Allies to follow-suit. Any remaining security tasks ascribed to nuclear weapons should be replaced by alternative security policies or mechanisms. We call on nuclear-armed states and their Allies to announce plans and processes for phasing out nuclear deterrence.

We welcome minimal initial steps, such as the No-First-Use policy of China, and the US interim objectives to move to a sole purpose doctrine - where the sole purpose of nuclear weapons is to deter other nuclear weapons - and to affirm as ever-lasting the practice of non-use of nuclear weapons. However, we believe that nuclear disarmament will not be possible until the NWS and their allies accept the conclusion of the International Court of Justice that the threat or use of nuclear weapons is generally illegal and that there is thus an obligation to pursue in good faith and conclude negotiations on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.

**Operational status of nuclear weapons**

Keeping nuclear weapons at high operational readiness and launch-on-warning policies create an unacceptable risk of nuclear war by accident or miscalculation. Steps should be taken immediately to increase the decision-making time for any nuclear response, to increase the operational time required for any launch, and launch-on-warning policies should be revoked.

**Transparency and verification**

States will be more confident in moving toward a nuclear-weapons-free world if they have a clear picture of current nuclear weapons stockpiles. We welcome the decision to invite the Secretary-General of the United Nations to establish a publicly accessible repository, which shall include information provided by the NWS, and we call on all NWS to provide information on all existing nuclear weapons, delivery systems, fissile material stockpiles and the financial costs of nuclear forces.

Future agreements will need to be verified. NWS and non-NWS should also explore and start to develop, in conjunction with NGO experts, the mechanisms and technologies for comprehensive verification in a nuclear-weapons-free world. In this regard we welcome the verification initiative undertaken by the UK and Norway with the assistance of the independent Verification Research, Training and Information Centre (VERTIC), and more recent civil society initiatives investigating the potential role of inter-governmental organisations in multilateral disarmament verification.

**Humanitarian consequences and international law**

We welcome the concern expressed by States Party to the NPT about the “catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons,” and the reaffirmation of the 2010 NPT Review Conference of “the need for all States at all times to comply with applicable international law, including international humanitarian law (IHL)” The application of international humanitarian law to nuclear weapons strengthens the norm against any use of nuclear weapons, and places an obligation on States to codify that norm through into international law prohibiting nuclear weapons.

We welcome the Vancouver Declaration on Law’s Imperative for the Urgent Achievement of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free World released on 11 February 2011 (see Appendix I) which concludes that ‘Nuclear weapons are incompatible with elementary considerations of humanity’, and the resolution of the Council of Delegates of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement entitled Working towards the elimination of nuclear weapons adopted on 26 November 2011 (see Appendix II) which concludes that any use of nuclear weapons would be incompatible with the rules of international humanitarian law, and that existing commitments and international obligations require States to ‘pursue in good faith and conclude with urgency and determination negotiations to prohibit the use of and completely eliminate nuclear weapons through a legally binding international agreement.’

The application of IHL to nuclear weapons thus changes the global nuclear disarmament agenda from one of incremental arms-reduction steps by the Nuclear Weapon States, to one which also includes comprehensive measures by all States to prohibit and abolish nuclear weapons.

In this context we welcome the initiative of Norway to host an international conference in 2013 to highlight the humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons, strengthen the political support for a ban on nuclear weapons and to develop practical conditions for the achievement of this goal.

**Building the framework for a nuclear-weapons-free world**

We welcome the agreement in the 2010 NPT Action Plan that: ”All States need to make special efforts to establish the necessary framework to achieve and maintain a world without nuclear weapons,” and the mention in this regard of “the Five-Point Proposal for Nuclear Disarmament of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, which proposes inter alia the consideration of negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention or a framework of separate mutually reinforcing instruments backed by a strong system of verification”

We call on the Conference on Disarmament to immediately commence work on negotiations on such a convention or framework of agreements. Should the CD fail to act, like-minded States should undertake preparatory work to explore and develop the legal, technical, political and institutional measures required to achieve a nuclear-weapons-free world, and to pave the way for actual negotiations. We welcome related proposals by governments, including the draft resolution to the 66th UN General Assembly entitled Taking forward multilateral disarmament negotiations (Appendix III), and also the numerous efforts by civil society and legislators to support this work.
Hereof, a key goal for establishing Nuclear Weapons Free Zones (NWFZ), is to abolish nuclear weapons in a certain geographical sphere as a part of building the essential framework for nuclear weapon free world. In this respect, we endorse strongly the adoption of a consensus final document action plan at the 2010 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference, particularly the conclusions and recommendations for follow-on actions plan that recognize efforts in this regard, inter alia, the convening the 2012 Conference for establishing a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East. The success of the 2012 Conference would be a significant achievement for promoting Nuclear Weapon Free World.

**Policies and practices inconsistent with nuclear disarmament obligations**

**Nuclear weapons modernization**

We welcome the agreement in the 2010 NPT Action Plan that All States parties should pursue policies that are fully compatible with the Treaty and the objective of achieving a world without nuclear weapons. Current practices by the NWS to modernize and indefinitely extend the lives of their nuclear weapons programs are incompatible with this obligation and should be cancelled.

**Nuclear weapons budgets**

The global annual spending on nuclear forces – many fold the annual budgets of the United Nations and the IAEA – is clearly inconsistent with nuclear disarmament commitments and obligations. We call for a systematic reduction of this budget over the next five years, with a reallocation of a portion of these resources toward building the security framework and institutional mechanisms for a nuclear-weapons-free world.

**The Middle East**

Conditions in the Middle East, a region of special concern characterized by a lack of trust, underlined the urgent need for a successful 2012 Conference to promote establishing a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other WMD in the Middle East. One State in the region – Israel - remains outside the NPT, in contravention of countless UN and IAEA resolutions pertaining to these issues, and rejects IAEA inspections over all of its nuclear facilities. Iran, which is a party to the NPT, has developed sensitive technologies and the IAEA Board of Governors has found that Iran’s failures and breaches constitute non-compliance with its safeguards agreements. Thus, we support a non-discriminatory approach to this situation by endorsing the 2012 Conference as a practical step to establish a Middle East Zone Free from Nuclear Weapons and all other Weapons of Mass Destruction (“the zone”).

Consequently, we welcome and enthusiastically support the agreement to convene the 2012 Conference in Finland under the auspices of the United Nations on the establishment of the zone, and the designation of the Finnish Facilitator, Ambassador Jaako Laajava, Under-Secretary of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland. This Conference should not be taken as a one time event, but should be the first step in a process leading to a legally binding treaty. The 2012 Conference should launch a process that leads to the establishment of the zone, addressing the issue of verification and on-site inspections, recognizing the role of IAEA and other relevant organizations with regard to such a zone, and the possible need to establish a specific mechanism or mechanisms for the zone.

We call upon the co-sponsors of the 1995 NPT Resolution on the Middle East and on the depositary States of the NPT to assume fully their commitments for the success of the 2012 Conference. We also call on States in the region to participate constructively in the conference, and on all States to support the work of the facilitator, and to continue participating in good faith in the process to achieve such a zone.

**Non-proliferation**

**Fissile materials**

We support an end to the production of fissile materials for use in nuclear weapons, a global accounting of existing stockpiles of weapon-useable fissile materials, and the placing of all such stockpiles under international control. Concrete steps toward these goals are welcomed, including moratoriums by States on fissile material production, the commencement of negotiations on a treaty to end production of fissile materials for use in nuclear weapons, and steps by the NWS to place non-military stockpiles under IAEA verification or control.

**Nuclear testing**

We call for the full ratification and entry-into-force of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in order to prevent nuclear-weapon test explosions for all time, and we call on States Parties to also end non-explosive forms of nuclear-weapons testing. We celebrate the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organisation and we commend the important work it undertakes to verify the CTBT, along with the positive contributions the CTBTO makes to earthquake monitoring, tsunami early warning, and radionuclide monitoring from accidents such as Fukushima.

**Security assurances**

The existence of nuclear arsenals creates a threat of the use of such weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States (NNWS), and thus increases the risk of proliferation in response. In order to reduce this risk we urge the NWS to provide effective guarantees to non-nuclear-weapon States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against them. In addition to the commitments taken on within the framework of UN Security Council Resolution 984 (1995) and the legally binding security assurances in the relevant Protocols to the treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs), we call upon the NWS to accelerate ratification of the remaining protocols to the regional NWFZ treaties. In addition, we also urge NWS to embark on negotiating and concluding a universal, unconditional and legally-binding convention on security assurances for NNWS. Until the conclusion of such a convention, NWS must respect their existing commitments regarding security assurances. As Negative Security Assurances are key elements to the establishment of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones, priority attention and executive steps should be made by NWS to concluding the ratification protocols to all NWFZ treaties, guaranteeing that nuclear weapon will not be threatened or used against the zones.
Nuclear Weapon Free Zones

Nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZs) play an important role in preventing nuclear proliferation, reducing the role of nuclear weapons in a region, providing guarantees that nuclear weapons will not be used against States in the region, and building the cooperative mechanisms for security that will help achieve a nuclear-weapons-free world. We applaud the recent entry-into-force of the African and Central Asian NWFZs, and reinforce the importance of the 2012 Conference to establish nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. In addition, we support the exploration of possible NWFZs in North East Asia, the Arctic, South Asia, and other regions. In this regard, we urge all States to extend their cooperation and to exert their utmost efforts with a view to ensure the early establishment of such zones.

International Atomic Energy Agency

We commend the International Atomic Energy Agency for effectively implementing its vital role to safeguard nuclear facilities and thus contribute to the prevention of nuclear weapons proliferation. We encourage all States to support and collaborate fully with the IAEA in its work, including in adopting and implementing the IAEA strengthened safeguards agreements.

Export controls

In line with UN Security Council Resolution 1540, all states should take and enforce effective measures to establish domestic controls to prevent the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons and their means of delivery. To that end, all states should put in place appropriate effective national export and trans-shipment controls over relevant items, including appropriate laws and regulations to control export, transit, trans-shipment and re-export and controls on providing funds and services related to such export and trans-shipment such as financing, and transporting.

Nuclear terrorism

All states should cooperate to minimize any risk that non-state actors may acquire, develop, traffic in or use nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and their means of delivery.

The danger of illicit trafficking of nuclear materials and their means of delivery and related materials by non-state actors as well as inadequate physical protection of fissile materials constitute a serious threat to international peace and security. Implementing Security Council Resolution 1540 adopted on 28 April 2004—supplemented by Resolution 1673 (2006) and Resolution 1810 (2008), and Security Council Resolution 1977 (2011)—would be an important step towards dealing with this challenge and would enhance and consolidate international cooperation to that end.

In 2005, the U.N. General Assembly adopted the International Convention for Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism which should be universally adhered to as it provides a legal basis for international cooperation in the investigation, prosecution, and extradition of those who commit terrorist acts involving radioactive materials or a nuclear device. In addition, in 2005 the U.N. Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material was amended to establish a legal obligation to secure nuclear materials in storage as well as in transport, and to criminalize acts of sabotage against civilian nuclear facilities. Once in force, the amended CPPNM will have a major impact in reducing the vulnerability of States Parties to nuclear terrorism.

In line with the outcomes of the two Nuclear Security Summits, all states should take appropriate steps to ensure that they retain secure custody of sensitive materials, equipment and technology and to prevent its diversion from peaceful purposes, whether at home or in other countries. To that end, all States that have not yet done so should adhere to the CPPNM as soon as possible. We recognize that some countries may require assistance in implementing these obligations in accordance with Security Council Resolution 1540.

Peaceful uses of nuclear energy

We reaffirm the inalienable right of States to develop their energy resources in order to meet their economic and social needs, consistent with global environmental preoccupations. In accordance with Article IV, we also reaffirm the right of States Party to the NPT to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The introduction of nuclear power in more countries must not lead to nuclear weapon proliferation. We urge all non-NWS to abide by existing IAEA safeguards and to work to strengthen the IAEA system.

The lack of a comprehensive global governance system for civilian nuclear activities based on full participation and equal rights and responsibilities is a barrier to the development of safe, secure and proliferation resistant nuclear fuel cycles. In full cooperation with the IAEA, states should investigate how to create a modern and effective governance system covering all parts of the nuclear fuel cycle from “cradle to grave”.

It is worth noting that providing incentives by sharing nuclear technology with nations outside the NPT, while depriving and withholding benefits of access to nuclear material and technology for peaceful purposes from those who comply with the NPT obligations, undermines the stability of the treaty with damaging consequences.

The experience of Fukushima has demonstrated the risks of nuclear energy in the face of accidents, natural disasters or other events leading to the release of radio-nuclides that threaten human health and the environment. We thus urge States to exercise caution in considering nuclear energy programs. Consequently, we encourage States to take all necessary measures to satisfy essential prerequisites as detailed in the IAEA Principles and guides when considering nuclear energy programs.

We encourage States to support the International Renewable Energy Agency and to utilize its expertise, upon their request, in order to develop energy supplies that are environmentally safe and also free from the risks of nuclear weapons proliferation.

Universality

The International community shares responsibility to uphold nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation by reinforcing universality of NPT non-proliferation and disarmament obligations for the sake of regional and international peace and
security. Accordingly, increased efforts must be made to engage with India, Pakistan, Israel and the Democratic Peoples’ Republic of Korea in order to move them to accept and implement universal non-proliferation and disarmament obligations, join or (rejoin) the NPT as NNWS, and participate in additional steps and measures to achieve the NPT goal of comprehensive and universal nuclear disarmament. In the meantime, bringing these States closer to the regime should, in no way, compromise the integrity of the NPT.

Other supportive measures

Disarmament and non-proliferation education

We call on all States Party to the NPT to implement the recommendations from the UN Study on Disarmament and Nonproliferation Education and to allocate resources to government agencies and non-governmental organisations to undertake this work.

Role of civil society

We believe that building the political momentum and developing the mechanisms to achieve a nuclear-weapons-free world will require collaboration between governments and key sectors of civil society including legislators, scientists, academics, youth and media. We encourage the NPT Review process and the relevant UN bodies to enable, with greater fervor, the fullest possible participation of civil society in their deliberations.

Conclusion

Since 2010, governments have take action at the highest levels on nuclear non-proliferation issues and agreements, including actions by the UN Security Council, convening the 2012 Summit on Nuclear Security, and national measures by many States including adopting additional IAEA safeguards, ratifying the CTBT and implementing relevant UN Security Council resolutions.

Similar action at the highest levels to implement nuclear disarmament commitments is unquestionably required, but unfortunately lacking. This is highlighted by the facts that minimal progress has been made on the disarmament agreements in the 2010 NPT Action Plan, and that the Conference on Disarmament remains unacceptably stalemated after 16 years of inaction.

We pledge to work to the best of our abilities to support governments in their deliberations during the 2012 NPT Prep Com in order to elevate disarmament action to the highest priority, accelerate the implementation of disarmament commitments, assisting in the full realization of the 2010 NPT Action Plan, stressing particularly the success of the 2012 Conference to a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapon of mass destruction in the Middle East - “regional zero”, as a part of achieving the goal of nuclear-weapons-free world - “global zero”.

Recommendations*

Distinguished Delegates,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is my pleasure to reinforce the recommendations presented by civil society during this session today.

We strongly encourage you to overcome the disarmament impasse during this Review cycle, so we can collectively avoid any weakening of the NPT regime. This beginning of the 2015 Review Cycle is a new opportunity to break from past timidity and we urge states to explicitly commit to concerted time-bound action that contributes to a global ban on nuclear weapons.

Towards this end, we call on States in full compliance with their treaty obligations to expend all necessary political capital, economic leverage and any other peaceful means of persuasion to demand that states begin “negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament.” Nuclear disarmament must constitute a foreign policy priority for all nations.

Starting negotiations on a Nuclear Weapons Convention or framework does not alleviate the urgent need for measures and steps which can be achieved immediately or in the medium term, including ratification and Entry-into-force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, stockpile reductions by all nuclear-weapons-possessing States, taking all nuclear forces off high operational readiness (high alert and launch-on-warning), banning the production of fissile materials, lowering the role of nuclear weapons in security doctrines, establishing additional nuclear-weapon-free zones— including the Middle East and NorthEast Asia, building verification capacities, implementing confidence-building measures and strengthening the legal norm against any use of nuclear weapons.

We call on the nuclear weapons states to eliminate nuclear weapons modernization programs. We recommend that funds be shifted away from nuclear weapon modernisation to, at a minimum, achieve the Millennium Development Goals.

We call on the nuclear weapons states to de-alert and de-couple their nuclear weapons from delivery systems.

We call on the UN Secretary General, Ban Ki-Moon to convene a meeting, as early as 2014, for the creation of a roadmap for the complete abolition of nuclear weapons. In this way he will honour the 33 heads of state from Latin American and the Caribbean who have expressed their support for such a high-level conference to set forth a programme, in stages, for the total elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified timeframe. The 2015 NPT Review Conference will then become the starting point for the realization of this roadmap meeting and the place to gain the consensus to conclude a Nuclear Weapons Convention. We trust that the 2015 NPT Review Conference will clearly show how and in

* Prepared and delivered by Susi Snyder, IKV Pax Christi
what timeframe a world without nuclear weapons will be realized.

We call on all states to recognize that military action is not an effective non-proliferation policy, it is counter to that - it is an incentive to proliferate.

This review cycle should be used to analyse the implementation of the 2010 Action Plan and to build upon it in order to achieve the legally-binding nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation obligations set out in the NPT. The 2010 Action Plan should be used as the basis for negotiating concrete time-bound commitments for further action—the final document of the 2015 Review Conference should not be limited to reaffirming the commitments made in 2000 and 2010 but must also include measures for further progress. We hope that you will accept the invitation of the Mayor of Hiroshima, Kazumi Matsui, to hold the next Review Conference in that city.

We call for all states parties to submit regular reports on their activities to implement the treaty, as well as the 2010 NPT Action Plan.

We urge all states to reaffirm the need to observe international humanitarian law and to seize any and all opportunities presented to you, including the recently announced Conference scheduled in Norway in early 2013, to recognize the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons.

If one or two countries continue to block progress at the Conference on Disarmament (CD) – as they have done for 16 years now - then governments have an obligation to explore and empower other for a to fulfil negotiating responsibilities. You can always swing it back into the CD if it becomes unblocked.

We call on nuclear weapon states, and states covered by ‘nuclear umbrellas’ or involved in nuclear sharing arrangements, to issue declaratory policies rejecting nuclear deterrence. To that end, countries under nuclear umbrella agreements should declare their security is not reliant on nuclear weapons.

We call on NATO countries to seize the opportunity presented by the coming Chicago Summit and the adoption of an Alliance Defence and Deterrence Posture Review to end the anachronistic practice of nuclear sharing, and remove U.S. weapons from five European countries. We hope to celebrate a return to full, unquestioned compliance with all treaty obligations in Belgium, Germany, Italy, Turkey and The Netherlands soon.

We demand states refrain from engaging in nuclear trade, of any type, with countries not party to the NPT.

We call on states to ensure that workers in Uranium mines and mills are fully informed as to the consequences of their work, and we urge governments to require industries to provide protective equipment to these workers to mitigate, in some small way, the risks they face.

We insist that states clean up the radioactive legacy at nuclear weapons development, production and testing facilities around the world. We demand that human rights obligations towards affected populations are met fully. To that end we encourage states to examine and implement recommendations that will be presented to the Human Rights Council in September 2012 by Special Rapporteur on the human rights obligations related to environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous substances and wastes, Calin Georgescu.

We urge states to close down sites that continue to produce materials related to the ongoing development, testing, and deployment of nuclear weapons and fissile materials. Ongoing monitoring of affected sites and their surrounding communities should take place so that damage to populations, water supplies and agricultural efforts from leaks or radioactive contamination entering the atmosphere around such facilities can be mitigated to the best extent possible.

We very much want to celebrate, with you, a nuclear-weapon-free world in our lifetimes. To that end, we urge you to heed the call made by UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon, in August 2010 in Hiroshima, who said “…let us pledge to join together on the 75th anniversary of the bombing -with the Hibakusha- to celebrate the end of nuclear weapons.”

We urge you to take the time to listen to the stories atom bomb survivors, they are here, they are ready and willing to share their heartbreak, their humanity and their hope with you.

We recommend that you promote and support the Mayors for Peace Atomic Bomb exhibitions, you can see this now here in the VIC, and it will also be in Vienna City Hall this week.

As you have heard repeatedly, we are calling on all States Parties to acknowledge and act on their responsibility to commence work on a global, legal ban on the development, possession, and use of nuclear weapons without further delay. The misguided view that work on nuclear disarmament can only be conducted in a strictly sequential manner must give way to parallel processes that advance various agendas, including laying the groundwork for the end goal itself. You have heard this from the Mayor of Nagasaki, from Parliamentarians, from atomic bomb survivors, and from a broad spectrum of civil society. This is your responsibility. It is time to act on it.