



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH MAY 2014 ARTICLES

This newsletter is part of Inter Press Service (IPS) and Soka Gakkai International (SGI) project. It includes independent news and analyses as well as columns by experts, news from international NGOs and a review of the global media for a glimpse of what is happening on the ground. Newspaper articles reproduced in this newsletter are for personal use and aim at giving information to readers. Reproduction in whole or in part without permission is forbidden.

In-Depth Reports

Eyewitness to Nuke Explosion Challenges World Powers



When the Foreign Minister of Marshall Islands Tony de Brum addressed a nuclear review Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) meeting at the United Nations last month, he asked whether anyone in the room had witnessed a nuclear explosion. The question was met, not surprisingly, with resounding silence. As a nine-year-old boy, the minister vividly remembered seeing the white flash of the Bravo detonation on Bikini atoll, six decades ago. It was 1,000 times more powerful than Hiroshima, he told PrepCom delegates, mostly proponents of nuclear dis-

armament. ➤ Pages 2-3

Peaceful Transitions From The Nuclear To The Solar Age

By HAZEL HENDERSON*



Japanese Buddhist and president of Soka Gakkai International (SGI) Daisaku Ikeda's [Peace Proposal 2014](#) elevated my focus from the daily news to my longer term concerns for more peaceful, equitable and sustainable human societies to assure our common future. These broader concerns are now shared by millions of humans who have transcended purely personal, local and nationalistic goals and become prototypical global citizens. Breakdowns in our current institutions now cause daily crises and are, as always, driving new breakthroughs as humans seek new solutions. Stress has always been a tool of evolution – as recorded in the 3.8 billion years of life forms on our home planet. ➤ Pages 4-5

What Others Say

Gaps Remain in U.N. WMD Resolution

The United Nations claims that a key Security Council resolution adopted unanimously back in 2004 has been instrumental in keeping weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) from the hands of terrorists and insurgent groups worldwide.

➤ Pages 6-7

The Politics of the CTBT

The [Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty](#) (CTBT) is not a nuclear issue anymore. It's actually a political one with nuclear powers pointing fingers at one another for not doing enough to ratify the treaty. However, most of the countries at the moment face internal problems -- both political and legal -- that are becoming their serious barrier to entry to the CTBT. ➤ Pages 8

Changing Nature Of Nuclear Deterrence In South Asia

There was a time when both the states of India and Pakistan were becoming successful in using tools to deter each other, but with the passing of time the nature of deterrence was changed — and could continue to change — if the existing strategic environment prevails. ➤ Pages 9

How Japan and North Korea 'Use' Each Other

[As Clint reported](#), the Japanese government announced on Monday that it will hold another round of talks with North Korea later this month. Back in March, [Pyongyang and Tokyo held their first government-to-government talks in 16 months](#). ➤ Pages 10-11

Civil Society Perspective ➤ Pages 12-15



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH MAY 2014 ARTICLES

In-Depth Reports

Eyewitness to Nuke Explosion Challenges World Powers

By THALIF DEEN



UNITED NATIONS (IPS) - When the Foreign Minister of Marshall Islands Tony de Brum addressed a nuclear review Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) meeting at the United Nations last month, he asked whether anyone in the room had witnessed a nuclear explosion.

The question was met, not surprisingly, with resounding silence.

As a nine-year-old boy, the minister vividly remembered seeing the white flash of the Bravo detonation on Bikini atoll, six decades ago. It was 1,000 times more powerful than Hiroshima, he told PrepCom delegates, mostly proponents of nuclear disarmament.

A two-week-long meeting of the PrepCom for the upcoming 2015 review conference on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) ended in predictable disappointment.

John Burroughs, executive director of the Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy and the U.N. Office of the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Arms (IALANA), told IPS the PrepCom succeeded in adopting an agenda for the 2015 conference.

But “to no one’s surprise, it did not accomplish anything else,” he added.

Burroughs, a member of the international legal team for Marshall Islands, said the most dramatic development of the PrepCom was the announcement of the Marshall Islands filing on Apr. 24 of lawsuits against the nine nuclear-armed states: the five permanent members (P5) of the Security Council, namely the United States, Britain, France, China and Russia, along with Israel, India, Pakistan and North Korea.

The cases, before the International Court of Justice in The Hague, claim those states have failed to meet obligations of nuclear disarmament and cessation of the nuclear arms race under the NPT and general international law, said Burroughs.

Between 1946 and 1958, the United States conducted 67 nuclear weapons tests in the Marshall Islands triggering health and environmental problems which still plague the nation with a little over 68,000 people.

The NPT, which came into force in 1970, requires a review conference to be held every five years. The last review conference took place in 2010.

The only nuclear powers which have refused to join the treaty are India, Pakistan, Israel and North Korea (which joined and later withdrew from the NPT).

South Korea’s Foreign Minister Yun Byung-Se, who chaired a meeting of the Security Council on Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD), pointed out last week that North Korea “is the only country in the world that has conducted nuclear tests in the 21st century.

“Notwithstanding the efforts of the international community, North Korea has continued to develop its nuclear weapons over the last two decades, and is now threatening its fourth nuclear test,” he added.

If North Korea succeeds in acquiring nuclear weapons, he said, it will seriously undermine the NPT regime and exacerbate tension and instability in Northeast Asia.



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH MAY 2014 ARTICLES

In-Depth Reports

Ambassador Enrique Roman-Morey of Peru, who chaired the PrepCom, admitted the meeting was unable to agree on an action plan for NPT.

“But this was due to lack of time, not lack of political will,” he said, pointing out the PrepCom does not negotiate.

Asked about the difficulties facing negotiators, he said when nuclear issues are discussed there are problems “from the first letter to the last letter” in the negotiated document.

A “working paper” resulting from the PrepCom will be the basis for future negotiations at the Review Conference.

Under the treaty, all parties to the NPT pledge not to transfer nuclear weapons or assist or encourage any non-nuclear weapon state to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons.

Similarly, each non-nuclear-weapon state undertakes not to receive the transfer of nuclear weapons or manufacture or otherwise acquire them.

Burroughs told IPS the PrepCom, like previous such meetings in the years prior to review conferences, could not reach consensus on recommendations to the 2015 conference.

Many states rejected the effort of the PrepCom chair to craft a compromise document.

The NPT nuclear-weapon states effectively maintained that commitments made by the 2010 Review Conference relating to nuclear arms control and disarmament should be carried forward into the next five-year period, he added.

He said the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and other groupings of non-nuclear weapon states held that the 2015 conference should adopt a more far-reaching plan of action that leads to verified, timebound elimination of nuclear weapons in the foreseeable future.

Many non-nuclear weapon states also said the proposed recommendations should have taken much fuller account of the conferences on humanitarian consequences of nuclear explosions, the last two held in Norway and Mexico, as well as the first-ever High-Level Meeting on Nuclear Disarmament held in the General Assembly in September 2013.

Burroughs said the debate at the PrepCom set the stage for consideration of a crucial question going into next year’s Review Conference: “Should non-nuclear weapon states insist, even if doing so results in no agreed outcome, that the conference set in motion multilateral negotiations on achieving a world free of nuclear weapons?”

A serious effort to that end was made in the 2010 conference but was rejected by the nuclear weapon states.

“Or, should they once again, as in the 1995, 2000, and 2010 conferences, agree to lesser commitments that have gone largely unfulfilled?” he said.

Still, most of those commitments remain valid and relevant whatever the 2015 conference does.

Thomas M. Countryman, U.S. assistant secretary at the Bureau of International Security and Nonproliferation, told PrepCom delegates that in 2015, Washington will “look to build upon the success of the 2010 NPT Review Conference, where the conference approved a comprehensive, 64-item Action Plan, the first of its kind in the NPT’s 44-year history.”

He said the United States will issue a national report on the steps taken so far to implement key elements of the 2010 Action Plan that uses a common framework agreed by all five nuclear weapon states.

“We will also highlight our contributions to International Atomic Energy Agency programmes harnessing the peaceful uses of nuclear energy for efforts like fighting disease, improving food security, and managing water resources,” he added. (IPS | May 12, 2014)

Image: Between 1946 and 1958, the United States conducted 67 nuclear weapons tests in the Marshall Islands, triggering health and environmental problems which still plague the nation. Credit: Christopher Michel/cc by 2.0 <>



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH MAY 2014 ARTICLES

In-Depth Reports

Peaceful Transitions From The Nuclear To The Solar Age

By HAZEL HENDERSON*



ST. AUGUSTINE, Florida (IPS) - Japanese Buddhist and president of Soka Gakkai International (SGI) Daisaku Ikeda's [Peace Proposal 2014](#) elevated my focus from the daily news to my longer term concerns for more peaceful, equitable and sustainable human societies to assure our common future. These broader concerns are now shared by millions of humans who have transcended purely personal, local and nationalistic goals and become prototypical global citizens.

Breakdowns in our current institutions now cause daily crises and are, as always, driving new breakthroughs as humans seek new solutions. Stress has always been a tool of evolution – as recorded in the 3.8 billion years of life forms on our home planet.

Today's crises are all consequences of our former myopic technological and social innovations addressing short-term problems without anticipating their system-wide longer-term effects. This is how I became concerned about how human burning of fossil fuels and digging in the Earth for

our energy which led me to join the World Future Society in the 1960s. I was then leading an effort to clean New York City's polluted air, living close by a huge coal-burning power plant pumping smoke and soot into the play park where I and other mothers watched our infants.

Fast forward to 2014, and I'm still a card-carrying futurist and on the Planning Committee of the Millennium Project which tracks our human family's 15 Global Challenges. Our latest [State of the Future Report 2014](#) tracks where we are progressing and where we are falling short in addressing these challenges: sustainable development and climate change; water; population and resources; democratisation; long-term policy making; globalisation of information technology; rich-poor gap; health; decision-making capacities; conflict resolution; improving the status of women; transnational organised crime; energy; science and technology, and global ethics. This Millennium Project has participants from academia, government, civic society and businesses in fifty countries.

At the same time, Daisaku Ikeda, also my esteemed co-author of *Planetary Citizenship*, leader of SGI's 12 million members, outlines his annual Peace Proposal for 2014, as he has done since 1983. Ikeda, born in 1928, is one of the world's most distinguished global citizens.

Ikeda's Peace Proposal 2014 – Value Creation for Global Change: Building Resilient and Sustainable Societies – engages United Nation issues: moving beyond the 2000 Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to the Agenda of 191 countries in Rio+20 in Brazil in 2012, as Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). These now embrace the transition from fossil and nuclear energy to the more decentralised, cleaner, greener, knowledge-rich, green economies now under way. I came to similar conclusions in my [Mapping the Global Transition to the Solar Age](#) (2014). Retiring human uses of fossil fuels, uranium and nuclear power plants and weapons is now feasible with current technologies as outlined in many reports covered in the [2014 Green Transition Scoreboard](#)®.

Political will in many countries is still hostage to special interests, lobbying and money from these legacy sectors and their perverse subsidies. Civic movements worldwide are pressuring pension funds and university endowments to divest from fossilised sectors and shift to cleaner, greener, more sustainable investments.

* Hazel Henderson is the president of Ethical Markets Media (USA and Brazil) and creator of the Green Transition Scoreboard®.



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH MAY 2014 ARTICLES

In-Depth Reports

Veteran financial experts, including Jeremy Grantham and Robert A. G. Monks, now join these critics, along with asset managers offering “fossil-free” portfolios which often outperform dirtier assets. As nuclear power plants are being decommissioned in the United States and Europe due to cheaper wind, solar and efficiency alternatives, many in Asia are still planned, even in China which now leads the world in solar energy.

Huge conceptual breakthroughs are needed to shift old paradigms and theory-induced blindness. One such is the rapidly developing proposal “Iran Goes Solar” by the Planck Foundation for Iran to end run the entire political debate about its right to develop civilian nuclear power. This could bypass all sanctions, Israel’s concerns about another nuclear weapons state in the Middle East and “electrify” the upcoming United Nation Conference on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

While Ikeda rightly calls for a “non-use” agreement under NPT, the Planck Foundation’s plan is a paradigm shifter. Iran could accelerate its transition from both nuclear and fossil fuels by immediately acquiring blocks of shares in China’s solar energy companies and then purchasing as many of their solar panels as possible. This is already a much cheaper alternative to building nuclear reactors or fossil fuel power plants.

Iran’s bountiful oil reserves would stay underground as valuable feedstocks for industrial use rather than burning them, a plan I proposed in the NBC-TV Today Show in 1965! Details of the Planck “Iran Goes Solar” plan also call for expanding rail services on the Silk Road to China, greening desert lands with salt-loving plants as in their [DesertCorp](#) plan for expanding seawater-based agriculture in many desert regions.

Today’s breakdowns are indeed producing the new systemic plans and breakthroughs long-proposed by futurists and planetary citizens. All these plans for our common future and green economies are covered by [Ethical Markets Media](#) (United States and Brazil), but often overlooked in mainstream media. (IPS | May 23, 2014) <>

TRANSLATIONS

ARABIC

<http://ipsinternational.org/arabic/nota.asp?idnews=3185>

JAPANESE

<http://www.nuclearabolition.info/index.php/japanese-chinese-korean/267-peaceful-transitions-from-the-nuclear-to-the-solar-age-japanese>

「視点」核時代から太陽光時代への平和的移行（ヘーゼル□ヘンダーソン「倫理的市場メディア」代表□未来学者）

【IPSコラム＝ヘーゼル□ヘンダーソン】

日本の仏教者で創価学会インタナショナル（SGI）の会長である池田大作氏の2014年の「平和提言」は、

日常のニュースから、人類共通の未来を確かなものにするためのより平和的で平等、持続可能な人間社会に向けたより長期的な関心へと私の焦点を引き上げてく

れました。これらの幅広い関心は、今では、個人的、地域的、国家的な目標を超越した何百万人もの世界市民によって共有されています。

私たちの社会の既存のしくみの崩壊は、今では日常的な危機を引き起こしています。しかし同時に、人類が新たな解決策を求めらる中で新たな突破口も創り

出しています。この惑星に38億年に亘って受け継がれてきた生命体に刻まれているように、ストレスは常に進化の手段であり続けてきました。



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH MAY 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say

Gaps Remain in U.N. WMD Resolution

By THALIF DEEN



While the resolution adds to the global WMD non-proliferation regime, there are concerns among several states about the instrumental use of the Security Council to bypass duly constituted multilateral negotiating forums. Credit: UN Photo/Paulo Filgueiras

UNITED NATIONS (IPS) - The United Nations claims that a key Security Council resolution adopted unanimously back in 2004 has been instrumental in keeping weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) from the hands of terrorists and insurgent groups worldwide.

At a meeting on May 7 to mark its 10th anniversary, Deputy Secretary-General Jan Eliasson said resolution 1540 has helped make important inroads against the proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical (NBC) weapons over the last decade.

But that only tells part of the story, he said, expressing regrets over “the setbacks and disappointments”, including the recent use of chemical weapons in Syria.

“However, through multilateral agreement, over 90 percent of Syria’s chemical weapons have been removed from the country even as the conflict has intensified,” Eliasson added.

A U.N. team investigating the use of these deadly weapons in Syria last year found “clear and convincing evidence” of Sarin gas attacks against civilians, including children.

But the team was not mandated either by the General Assembly or the Security Council to probe whether the weapons were used by government military forces or armed insurgents – leaving the question of accountability wide open.



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH MAY 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say

The mandate was only to determine whether chemical weapons had been used, not by whom.

Tariq Rauf, director Disarmament, Arms Control and Non-Proliferation Programme at the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), told IPS the resolution was adopted a decade ago to close the gaps in the domestic legislation of member states.

The primary aim was to prevent the spread or access to WMD materials and technologies to non-state actors such as terrorist groups or criminals through the implementation of legislation providing for effective controls and criminal penalties.

He said the resolution does not duplicate nor impinge upon existing multilateral non-proliferation treaties and organisations, including the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW).

Eliasson told May 7 meeting it is critical for every country to implement the resolution. "Terrorists and traffickers tend to target countries whose customs, borders, imports, exports, ports and airports are less well monitored or controlled," he said. One promising trend, he pointed out, is the preparation of voluntary national implementation action plans.

At the recent Nuclear Security Summit in The Hague, 32 countries released a joint statement reaffirming a commitment to submit such action plans to the '1540 Committee' coordinating the implementation of the resolution.

The Western powers have expressed concern that terrorist groups, specifically Al-Qaeda, may be attempting to acquire WMDs.

Still over the last 10 years following the adoption of the resolution, North Korea has gone nuclear while Iran is accused of trying to develop nuclear weapons (which it vehemently denies).

And Saudi Arabia has threatened to go nuclear if Iran joins the group of nine nuclear weapons states: including the five permanent members (P5) of the Security Council, namely, the United States, Britain, France, China and Russia, along with India, Pakistan, Israel and North Korea.

The five major nuclear powers have consistently asserted they don't want WMDs to fall into the "wrong hands" – a code word for terrorists and insurgent groups.

But Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon says "there are no right hands for wrong weapons."

The anti-nuclear activists, who call for a total elimination of WMDs, say there are "no right hands or wrong hands" for nuclear weapons which should be removed from everyone's hands.

Rauf told IPS the resolution adopted under chapter VII of the U.N. Charter is mandatory for all U.N. member states. It complements but does not replace nor is it a substitute for multilaterally negotiated arms control treaties.

A Security Council committee to promote implementation of 1540 has been set up to assist states in their implementation of the resolution. However, he said not all member states are reporting to the committee as the reporting format is considered quite complex and taxes the capacity of many states.

While the resolution adds to the global WMD non-proliferation regime, there are concerns among several states about the instrumental use of the Security Council to bypass duly constituted multilateral negotiating forums such as the Conference on Disarmament, and the U.N. General Assembly, where more or all states are represented.

He said the Security Council is not considered a globally democratic body as it has permanent members with a veto and a very small number of other states elected for two year terms.

In sum, the resolution is a useful instrument but it cannot be compared in importance or legitimacy to global WMD treaties since such treaties have been duly negotiated in open multilateral forums where member states have a say and thus have greater legitimacy and authority, he declared. (IPS | May 7, 2014) <>



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH MAY 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say

The Politics of the CTBT

By HUSSAIN NADIM*

The [Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty](#) (CTBT) is not a nuclear issue anymore. It's actually a political one with nuclear powers pointing fingers at one another for not doing enough to ratify the treaty. However, most of the countries at the moment face internal problems -- both political and legal -- that are becoming their serious barrier to entry to the CTBT.

This was the highlight of the [UK Project on Nuclear Issues](#) (PONI) event that was recently organised by Royal United Services Institute for Defence and Security Studies (RUSI) in London where I was representing Pakistan's view on the CTBT.

Pakistan is, what I like to call, a reluctant nuclear power. It never really chose to be one; instead it was forced to take that path. Having lost half of the country in the 1971 war with India, the 1974 nuclear tests conducted by India sent an alarm throughout the security apparatus of Pakistan, thereby creating a serious security dilemma. For the next two decades, the establishment of Pakistan had a one-point agenda: develop nuclear capacity, and on the road to that, the country deprioritised everything else. Whether right or wrong, that is how the Pakistani establishment looked at the problem back in the day. Moreover, Pakistan was never the first one to test its nuclear capacity either. In 1998 again, it was India that went ahead with the tests, forcing Pakistan to follow. Hence, began the nuclear arms race in the region that Pakistan had to reluctantly be a party to.

Given that context, what are some of the barriers to entry to the CTBT for Pakistan? At the moment, [after 16 years of nuclear tests](#) in Pakistan, the barriers to entry are both external and internal. Externally, Pakistan has been in a state of war throughout most of its existence with two of its neighbours not accepting its borders. Given the Kashmir issue, it is highly unlikely that Pakistan will be able to reach that level of trust to sign and ratify the CTBT without India doing it first. Signing it means political responsibility, and ratification means legal responsibility that neither of the countries is ready to consider at the moment.

Another barrier to entry is driven by how Pakistan is treated differently from India on the subject of nuclear technology. While India and Pakistan have the same status on the nuclear issue, the United States went ahead and offered a [civil nuclear deal to India](#) and extended its support to become part of the Nuclear Suppliers Group, whereas Pakistan was completely ignored on that front. Such discrimination creates a serious hurdle for Pakistan to even consider the CTBT.

The external narrative on Pakistan's nuclear capacity has a direct impact on its internal barriers to entry. For instance, there are non-state and political actors who have labelled the nuclear bomb as an 'Islamic bomb'. The amount of sentiment and significance that has been attached to the nuclear bomb in Pakistan goes beyond just politics.

However, the depressing part is that despite all the technical issues associated with the CTBT, Pakistan's desperate efforts to denuclearise the region have failed. The security establishment is well aware that India's nuclear ambitions are not solely targeted towards Pakistan, but that India has international aspirations as well, which is why to reduce the burden, Pakistan has over the years made several attempts to sort out the nuclear issue. On 22 occasions -- internationally and elsewhere -- Pakistan has endorsed the CTBT, whereas India has always rejected it.

For Pakistan, achieving some level of trust and understanding with India on the issue is not just a high priority, but something that's extremely beneficial. With a halt on the nuclear arms race, Pakistan can focus its efforts and energies on developing its economy, infrastructure and pacing up its efforts on achieving the MDGs. The nuclear issue is holding back Pakistan, and Indian arrogance on the subject isn't helping the cause either.

The only way forward on the CTBT is by solving the pressing border problems, the Kashmir issue, and cross-border militancy. Also, it is important to educate the people in Pakistan and India on the nuclear programme to flush out the emotions attached to the bomb so that pragmatism can prevail.

Published in The Express Tribune, May 31, 2014. <http://tribune.com.pk/story/715408/the-politics-of-the-ctbt/>

The writer is Special Assistant to Federal Minister at the Ministry of Planning, Development & Reforms.



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH MAY 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say

Changing Nature Of Nuclear Deterrence In South Asia

By ALI RAZA*

May 28 - There was a time when both the states of India and Pakistan were becoming successful in using tools to deter each other, but with the passing of time the nature of deterrence was changed — and could continue to change — if the existing strategic environment prevails.

A number of factors are responsible for changing the nature of nuclear deterrence in South Asia i.e., the introduction of new strategies and doctrines, the quest for a defense shield, technical progress and other secondary factors, including the role of media whether it is social media, print media or electronic media. In this respects, the media, which also has been considered as important entity in India, is playing a very negative role — by the reporting of propaganda or giving hype to sensitive issues media from Indian should perform more wisely and with some maturity.

Policy makers from the Indian side are trying to coin new strategies to deter Pakistan and are also in a quest of hegemonic status for India in the region, which is resulting in changing the existing nature of nuclear deterrence. India is formulating new policies and strategies which according to its policy makers would be proved fruitful for India, but they fail to be mindful of the fact that experiments in such a sensitive business could be highly dangerous for not only the fate of India, but for the whole region.

Furtherance in conventional aspects may also provide justifications for each side in the launching of a nuclear weapon. India is continuously expanding its conventional arsenals. According to reports, India is a leading buyer of conventional arms. Between 1999 and 2006, India totaled \$22.4 billion in arms sales agreements, according to a 2007 report by the U.S. Congressional Research Service. That total made India first among all developing arms buyers during that period. India became the leading global arms importer in the period from 2007 to 2011, accounting for ten percent of total arms imports.

This trend is expected to continue, with an announced increase of 17 percent in defense spending for the fiscal year 2012-2013. It is clear from the reports that India is continuously pursuing ambitions that are highly unfavorable for the region. The steps which have been taken by the India in furtherance of conventional aspects may damage the stability of the region. It would also not be wrong to mention that actually India is confusing the purpose of deterrence. As a bigger state of the region India should lead from the front for the exploration of new horizons of Confidence Building Measures (CBM'S) with Pakistan to strengthen the stability of the region.

Pakistan is quite satisfied with the existing pattern of deterrence, which is also currently prevailing to some extent in South Asia. But, a question does arise: Why is Pakistan continuously exploring ways which ultimately lead towards the possession of low-yield nuclear weapons and advancement of nuclear capabilities? The answer to this question can be addressed in a way that it was India which was strongly portraying its Cold Start Doctrine and also showing its urge of getting defense shield. Keeping in view these initiatives or intentions of India there was no other choice left for Pakistan rather than pursuing of low-yield nuclear weapons and the advancement of its nuclear capabilities. In other words, it would not be wrong to mention that Pakistan is being compelled by India to follow or adapt such ways and policies.

After the careful study of history and acute consultation of to-date existing literature, it can be strongly determined that the only purpose behind possessing deterrence for every nuclear weapon state is to secure itself from the aggression of an adversary state, which will result in maintaining peace. Therefore, it is pretty clear from the origin of deterrence that it is a political tool and sole purpose at the back end of deterrence is the maintenance, furtherance and stability of peace among states, which should be followed by the states that are in race with each other.

Deterrence should not be manipulated for the purposes of gaining ultimate supremacy, but nevertheless, India's current policies are disturbing the existing pattern of deterrence without keeping in view that repercussions would be dire for the whole region. Now the question arises that why is Pakistan not following the lines which are being followed by the India? The answer to this question is quite simple — Pakistan does not want to take such steps that ultimately could lead towards an arms race, and a change in deterrence patterns. This in itself shows that Pakistan is mature and concerned about the strategic stability of region. In other words, it would not be wrong to mention that Pakistan doesn't want to instigate any adversary state in a nuclear manner for the survival of strategic stability of region. <>

*Ali Raza works at Strategic Vision Institute. Source: Eurasia Review



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH MAY 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say

How Japan and North Korea 'Use' Each Other

By ZACHARY KECK

May 21 - [As Clint reported](#), the Japanese government announced on Monday that it will hold another round of talks with North Korea later this month. Back in March, [Pyongyang and Tokyo held their first government-to-government talks in 16 months](#).

[According to The Japan Times](#), Foreign Minister Fumio Kishida told reporters on Monday that Japanese and North Korean diplomats will meet in Stockholm on May 26-28 to discuss a wide range of issues, including [North Korea's past abductions of Japanese citizens](#) and its nuclear and ballistic missile program.

The meeting is noteworthy, Clint rightly noted, mainly in that it is being held in Europe instead of Asia. The two sides usually hold their bilateral meetings in Asia, particularly China. The media reports gave no indication as to why the two sides decided to meet in Stockholm this time around but North Korea does maintain diplomatic relations with Sweden.

While it's impossible to know with any degree of certainty, it's possible that the decision to hold the talks in Europe rather than China was strategic in nature. One of the reasons that North Korea has mounted something of a charm offensive towards Japan in recent months is to help maximize the small degree of leverage the country holds over China. Beijing has noticeably strengthened its policy against North Korea under Xi Jinping, particularly regarding the country's nuclear weapons program. Indeed, just this week Russia and China released a joint statement expressing common concern over North Korea's nuclear program.

By reaching out to Japan at a time when the latter is embroiled in a bitter dispute with China, North Korea is seeking to demonstrate to its patron in Beijing that there are potential consequences for talking a harder line against Pyongyang. Japan too has an interest in demonstrating it can complicate China's strategic calculus in any way possible, with North Korea being one such way.

Indeed, there is a long history of Japan and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) using each other for other ends. Take South Korea, for example. Japan and the United States have sought to exploit the common threat North Korea poses to Tokyo, Seoul and Washington to improve relations between South Korea and Japan. Just this week the U.S. tabled another proposal for increased trilateral intelligence sharing regarding North Korea's missile and nuclear programs. Such proposals have always failed to date, owing to deep mistrust between South Korea and Japan, but nonetheless Pyongyang remains a useful lever for Tokyo to use in trying to improve relations with Seoul without conceding on any of the historical issues.

For North Korea, Japan is first and foremost useful for domestic political purposes. Indeed, Japan's colonialism is at the heart of the North Korean regime's domestic legitimacy, as evidenced by—among other things—the fact that it appears in the preamble to the DPRK constitution. As an *NK News* [analysis explains](#): “The resistance to Japanese aggression is a founding principle of the North Korean State and one of the primary characteristics of Kim Il Sung in the collective memory of North Koreans.”

One of the things the DPRK promises to its citizens is that it will prevent another foreign power from dominating the country like Japan dominated the Korean Peninsula during the colonial era. This is one of the reasons why the Korean War is given such importance in North Korean propaganda. According to the Pyongyang-sanctioned version of the Korean War, the U.S. invaded North Korea to colonize it just as Japan had done previously. And, according to this story line, this plan would have worked had it not been for the genius leadership of Kim Il-Sung in fighting off the aggression.

Japanese colonialism and the memory of it also presents North Korea with a number of opportunities with regards to South Korea. To begin with, North Korea attempts to undermine the legitimacy of the South Korean government by portraying its relationship with the U.S. as a continuation of colonialism that began with Japan. In the North Korean regime's portrayal, South Korea is still a colony to a foreign power who is exploiting it. North Koreans would be suffering the same fate were it not for Kim Il-Sung's leadership during the Korean War (not to mention, his fierce resistance to Japanese colonialism).

Source: <http://thediplomat.com/2014/05/how-japan-and-north-korea-use-each-other/>



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH MAY 2014 ARTICLES

What Others Say



Image Credit: Japanese and North Korean flags via Shutterstock

At the same time, North Korea seeks common ground with South Korea through their continued anger at Japan for the colonial period. As the same *NK News* analysis cited above points out, while the two Koreas disagree on almost every issue, “opposition to Japan is perhaps one of the few points over which North and South Korea tend to have a unified position. Whether it is about the territorial dispute over the Liancourt Rocks (Dok-do in Korean, Takeshima in Japanese) or the apology on wartime issues, both North and South identify Japan as the wrongdoer.”

North Korea seeks to exploit and perpetuate that. For instance, when Japan apologized to South Korea in 2010 for its former occupation of the Peninsula, North Korea was quick to emphasize the egregiousness of the occupation and the insufficiency of the apology.

“The Japanese imperialists enforced the harshest colonial rule in history over Korea, bringing unspeakably horrible misfortune and sufferings and disasters to the Korean nation,” [a North Korean spokesperson said at the time](#). He added: “Japan should make a sincere apology and make full reparation to the Korean nation for its aggression and crimes against humanity.”

Thus, Japan offers the North Korean government a rare opportunity to make common cause not just with the South Korean government but more importantly with the South Korean people as a whole. This is crucial given Pyongyang’s nominal claim to be the legitimate government of the entire Korean Peninsula.

The larger point is that both North Korean and Japan use each other primarily to posture towards third parties. This is more important to both states’ interests than actually establishing diplomatic relations with each other. <>



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH MAY 2014 ARTICLES

Civil Society Perspective

The Flagrant Contradictions of Nuclear-Dependent States

By CESAR JARAMILLO

It's hard to tell whether the states questioning the purpose, direction, and convenience of the humanitarian imperative for nuclear disarmament are fully aware of the extent to which the inconsistencies in their positions are apparent to the rest of the international community. Because the contradictions are, well, quite obvious.

Take, for example, the discomfort expressed by a small group of states at the tone and language in the [Chair's Summary](#) from the Second Conference on the Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons hosted by Mexico in February. The reason for the discomfort? The Chair's Summary dared to move the discourse beyond the technical exposition of the catastrophic impact of nuclear weapons and introduced the need for specific follow-up action. (Not coincidentally, the protesters are mainly nuclear weapons states and those relying on extended deterrence arrangements.)

But here's the catch: even as these states chastise the Mexican Government for unequivocally signaling the need to seriously consider concrete measures to avoid the devastation that any use of nuclear weapons would bring, they complain that the humanitarian initiative doesn't seem to be going anywhere. It's a clever strategy. They obfuscate and condemn any effort to explicitly move the humanitarian process forward, while at the same time criticizing it for a lack of direction. But a growing number of states and civil society organizations see right through this ploy.

The humanitarian initiative was never focused on merely recognizing the impact of nuclear weapons, but on drawing out the policy implications that follow from such a recognition. Some states fear what this process might yield. The logical progression of the humanitarian initiative is to move discussion from the technical to the political. Otherwise it will stall in emotion. Adherents of the process are keenly aware that, by vehemently resisting the transition into policy territory, nuclear-dependent states are attempting to render the process pointless—so they can then criticize it for being pointless.

Therein lies the discontent with Mexico. Those who challenge the viability of the process argue that the Mexican Conference Chair's determination to open the door to a serious political process dealt a blow to the cause of nuclear disarmament. But it did quite the contrary. It invigorated it.

Paradoxically, if nuclear dependent states had their way and prevented the humanitarian initiative from entering policy territory, they would reduce the process to a

merely 'educational' exposé of the issues—exactly the type of exercise whose validity they have long questioned claiming that they are completely aware of the humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons.

An intractable dead-end logic is inherent in their positions. If the process is a merely technical one, it is challenged on grounds of redundancy. And if it moves into policy waters, it is challenged on grounds of political viability.

The push for nuclear disarmament is shaping up to be an asymmetrical political struggle. Those used to having a disproportionate influence at certain forums are stressing the importance of those very forums and decrying the ones driven by other agendas and players. Those who champion abolition are building up the pressure for concrete progress toward disarmament.

In this context, it's not surprising that

- Mexico has taken this bold stand in the face of stiff resistance from several nations, including its most important trading partner;
- in an unprecedented move, the tiny Marshall Islands are suing all nuclear weapons states at the International Court of Justice for not fulfilling their disarmament obligations;
- last year, for the first time, a state party to the NPT—Egypt—walked out of the PrepCom plenary;
- various Arab states threaten to follow suit at the 2015 NPT Review Conference;
- the proposal for a ban treaty has been explicitly endorsed by dozens of nations;
- civil society advocacy of nuclear disarmament is as effective, organized and sophisticated as it has ever been;
- national delegates at the Mexican conference could be seen wearing the Abolition pin on their lapels.



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH MAY 2014 ARTICLES

Civil Society Perspective

To be sure, it is not that the step-by-step approach as advocated by nuclear dependent states (and called 'pragmatic' by nuclear dependent states) completely lacks validity. Yes, it is one conceivable way forward. It's just that it has proven to be to be a very inadequate one, and hardly reflects the gravity and urgency of the problem with nuclear weapons.

To deflect criticism of current efforts toward nuclear disarmament, nuclear-dependent states contend that the world is safer with the NPT than without it. True, but they miss the point.

The real question is this: can the current dynamics of the global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime, including but not limited to the NPT, deliver on the promise of nuclear abolition? With poor prospects for a "yes," an increasing number of non-nuclear weapons states are openly challenging the status quo.

The nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime is crumbling under the weight of its own internal contradictions. Yet nuclear-dependent states are attempting to torpedo the most decisive push to actual progress on nuclear disarmament in decades. And as they persist in faulty reasoning and wilful blindness, an honest and open conversation on how to eliminate nuclear weapons becomes that much more difficult.

This article was submitted as a discussion paper for meetings of the Canadian Network to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (CNANW). Ottawa, 13-14 May 2014.

Source: <http://ploughshares.ca/2014/05/the-flagrant-contradictions-of-nuclear-dependent-states/>



International Trade Unions Call For Ban Treaty

By JOHN LORETZ

May 23 - The [International Trade Unions Confederation](#) (ITUC), an ICAN partner organization, issued a [general statement](#) from its World Congress yesterday in Berlin, in which it said world leaders and international institutions "have failed to eliminate nuclear weapons and deliver global peace," and called for "a treaty to ban the use, manufacture, stockpiling and possession of nuclear weapons as a first step towards their complete eradication." The ITUC also called for regulation of the small arms trade and said that "hundreds of billions of dollars of military expenditure must be better spent meeting vital needs for sustainable employment and development."

The language on nuclear weapons was proposed by the Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions, and ICAN campaigners have been urging their national ITUC chapters to support the call for a ban at this Congress. The statement was adopted unanimously.

This is a major accomplishment for ICAN, which has made engagement with labor groups—and other civil society organizations that have not traditionally focused on the nuclear issues—an important priority. <>

Source: <http://peaceandhealthblog.com/2014/05/23/ituc-ban/>



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH MAY 2014 ARTICLES

Civil Society Perspective

After Mexico: Why an “Ottawa Process” For a Legal Ban of Nuclear Weapons Deserves Our Enthusiastic Support

By ALICE SLATER*

The 1970 Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), extended indefinitely in 1995 when it was due to expire, provided that five nuclear weapons states which also happened to hold the veto power on the Security Council (P-5) – the US, Russia, UK, France, and China– would “pursue negotiations in good faith” [1] for nuclear disarmament. In order to buy the support of the rest of the world for the deal, the nuclear weapons states “sweetened the pot” with a Faustian bargain promising the non-nuclear weapons state an “inalienable right” [2] to so-called “peaceful” nuclear power, thus giving them the [keys to the bomb factory](#).

Every country in the world signed the new treaty except for India, Pakistan, and Israel, which went on to develop nuclear arsenals. North Korea, an NPT member, took advantage of the technological know-how it acquired through its “inalienable right” to nuclear power and quit the treaty to make its own nuclear bombs. Today there are nine nuclear weapons states with 17,000 bombs on the planet, 16,000 of which are in the US and Russia!

At the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference, a new network of NGOs, [Abolition 2000](#), called for immediate negotiations of a treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons and a phase out of nuclear power. A working group of lawyers, scientists and policy makers drafted a [Model Nuclear Weapons Convention](#) laying out all the necessary steps to be considered for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. It became an official UN document and was cited in Secretary General Ban Ki-moon’s 2008 proposal for a [Five Point Plan for Nuclear Disarmament](#). The NPT’s indefinite extension required Review Conferences every five years, with Preparatory Committee meetings in between.

In 1996, the NGO World Court Project sought an [Advisory Opinion from the International Court of Justice](#) on the legality of the bomb. The Court ruled unanimously that an international obligation exists to “conclude negotiations on nuclear disarmament in all its aspects,” but disappointingly said only that the weapons are “generally illegal” and held that it was unable to decide whether it would be legal or not to use nuclear weapons “when the very survival of a state was at stake.” Despite the NGOs best efforts at lobbying for continued promises given by the P-5 at subsequent NPT reviews, progress on nuclear disarmament was frozen. In 2013, Egypt actually walked out of an NPT meeting because a promise made in 2010 to hold a conference on a Weapons of Mass Destruction Free Zone in the Middle East (WMDFZ) had still not taken place, even though a promise for a WMDFZ was offered to the Middle East states as a bargaining chip to get their vote for the indefinite extension of the NPT nearly 20 years earlier in 1995.

In 2012, the International Committee of the Red Cross made an [unprecedented breakthrough effort](#) to educate the world that there was no existing legal ban on the use and possession of nuclear weapons despite the catastrophic humanitarian consequences that would result from nuclear war, thus renewing public awareness about the terrible dangers of nuclear holocaust. A new initiative, the [International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons \(ICAN\)](#) had been launched to make known the disastrous effects to all life on earth should nuclear war break out, either by accident or design, as well as the inability of governments at any level to adequately respond. They are calling for a legal ban on nuclear weapons, just as the world had banned chemical and biological weapons, as well as landmines and cluster munitions. In 1996, NGOs in partnership with friendly nations, led by Canada, met in Ottawa, in an unprecedented circumvention of the blocked UN institutions to negotiate a treaty to ban on landmines. This became known as the “Ottawa Process” which was also used by Norway in 2008, when it hosted a meeting outside the blocked UN negotiating fora to hammer out a [ban on cluster munitions](#).

[1] “Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament.”

[2] Article IV: Nothing in this Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all the Parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination...”

*Alice Slater is New York Director of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation and serves on the Coordinating Committee of Abolition 2000.



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH MAY 2014 ARTICLES

Civil Society Perspective

Norway also took up the call of the International Red Cross in 2013, hosting a special Conference on the Humanitarian Effects of Nuclear Weapons. The Oslo meeting took place outside of the usual institutional settings such as the NPT, the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva and the First Committee of the General Assembly, where progress on nuclear disarmament has been frozen because the nuclear weapons states are only willing to act on non-proliferation measures, while failing to take any meaningful steps for nuclear disarmament.

This, despite a host of empty promises made over the 44-year history of the NPT, and nearly 70 years after the 1945 bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The P-5 boycotted the Oslo conference, issuing a joint statement claiming it would be a “distraction” from the NPT! Two nuclear weapons states did show up—India and Pakistan, to join the 127 nations that came to Oslo and those two nuclear weapons states again attended this year’s follow-up conference hosted by Mexico, with 146 nations.

There is transformation in the air and a shift in the zeitgeist in how nations and civil society are addressing nuclear disarmament. They are meeting in partnership in greater numbers and with growing resolve to negotiate a nuclear ban treaty which would prohibit the possession, testing, use, production and acquisition of nuclear weapons as illegal, just as the world has done for chemical and biological weapons. The ban treaty would begin to close the gap in the World Court decision which failed to decide if nuclear weapons were illegal in all circumstances, particularly where the very survival of a state was at stake.

This new process is operating outside of the paralyzed institutional UN negotiating structures, first in Oslo, then in Mexico with a third meeting planned in Austria, this very year, not four years later in 2018 as proposed by the non-aligned movement of countries which fail to grasp the urgent need to move swiftly for nuclear abolition, and has not received any buy-in from the recalcitrant P-5. Indeed, the US, France and UK didn’t even bother to send a decent representative to the first high level meeting in history for heads of state and foreign ministers to address nuclear disarmament at the UN’s General Assembly last fall. And they opposed the establishment of the UN Open Ended Working Group for Nuclear Disarmament that met in Geneva in an informal arrangement with NGOs and governments, failing to show up for a single meeting held during the summer of 2013.

At Nayarit, Mexico, the Mexican Chair sent the world a Valentine on February 14, 2014 when he concluded his remarks to a standing ovation and loud cheers by many of the government delegates and the NGOs in attendance saying:

The world has begun an Ottawa process for nuclear weapons that can be completed in the very near future if we are united and focused! One obstacle that is becoming apparent to the success of achieving a broadly endorsed ban treaty is the position of “nuclear umbrella” states such as Japan, Australia, South Korea and NATO members. They ostensibly support nuclear disarmament but still rely on lethal “nuclear deterrence,” a policy which demonstrates their willingness to have the US incinerate cities and destroy our planet on their behalf.

Achieving a ban treaty negotiated without the nuclear weapons states would give us a cudgel to hold them to their bargain to negotiate for the total elimination of nuclear weapons in a reasonable time by shaming them for not only failing to honor the NPT but for totally undermining their “good faith” promise for nuclear disarmament. They continue to test and build new bombs, manufacturing facilities, and delivery systems while Mother Earth is assaulted with a whole succession of so-called “sub-critical” tests, as these outlaw states continue to blow up plutonium underground at the Nevada and Novaya Zemlya test sites. The P-5’s insistence on a “step-by-step” process, supported by some of the nuclear “umbrella states,” rather than the negotiation of a legal ban demonstrates their breathtaking hypocrisy as they are not only modernizing and replacing their arsenals, they are actually spreading nuclear bomb factories around the world in the form of nuclear reactors for commercial gain, even “sharing” this lethal technology with India, a non-NPT party, an illegal practice in violation of the NPT prohibition against sharing nuclear technology with states that failed to join the treaty.

With a follow-up meeting coming in Austria, December 8th and 9th of this year, we should be strategic in pushing the impetus forward for a legal ban. We need to get even more governments to show up in Vienna, and make plans for a massive turnout of NGOs to encourage states to come out from under their shameful nuclear umbrella and to cheer on the burgeoning group of peace-seeking nations in our efforts to end the nuclear scourge!

Check out the [ICAN campaign](#) to find out how you can participate in Vienna. www.icanw.org <>



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION

NEWSLETTER FOR STRENGTHENING AWARENESS OF NUCLEAR ABOLITION
WITH MAY 2014 ARTICLES



TOWARD A NUCLEAR FREE WORLD



<http://www.nuclearabolition.info/>



People's Decade for Nuclear Abolition

Initiated by Soka Gakkai International (SGI)



<http://www.peoplesdecade.org/>

6-7 Dec, 2014
ICAN CIVIL SOCIETY FORUM VIENNA

Time to ban
Nuclear weapons

ican
international campaign
to abolish nuclear weapons

for more info:
vienna@icanw.org

<http://www.icanw.org/>

**Publisher: Global Cooperation Council [umbrella organisation of IPS-Inter Press Service
Deutschland] SGI-IPS Project Director: Katsuhiro Asagiri | President IPS Japan
SGI-IPS Project Coordinator | Editor-in-Charge: Ramesh Jaura**